DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 032 070 JC 690 333

Developing Institutions: The Junior College; An Interim Report of the First Year of the Program with Developing Institutions.
American Association of Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C. Program with Developing Institutions.
Pub Date Jul 69
Note 98p.
EDRS Price MF -$0.50 HC -$5.00
Descriptors -Conferences, *Consultants, *Junior Colleges, Workshops
Identifiers -American Association of Junior Colleges, Program with Developing Institutions

AAJC became the coordinator between USOE and colleges needing help (under Title III), after lack of expertise by those needing it most had become apparent in applications for federal funds. Agreement was reached on an extensive 3-part program: expert consultants to help colleges assess their strengths, weaknesses, and potential; national and regional meetings for exchange of ideas; year-round flow of information. The funds for 85 colleges (and selected associates) were handled expeditiously. First steps in the Program with Developing Institutions were the assembling of a national advisory council, regional coordinators, project staff, college contacts, a consultant panel and their assignments, and plans for publications and regional meetings. In June 1968, a national meeting was held at Airlie to review the whole program. The first round of consulting, done in three areas (administration, finance, planning, research, community service; curriculum and faculty; and student personnel services), produced many recommendations, and evaluations by both consultants and colleges. According to area needs, regional workshops were held and a publication program established. This report gives the background of the program, an overall evaluation, conclusions, and implications for the future. Appendices present additional details on several aspects. (HH)

ED032070

DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS:

THE JUNIOR COLLEGE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

An Interim Report
of the
First Year
of
The Program With Developing Institutions

A New Approach to Extensive College Aid
by the
American Association of Junior Colleges
and
The United States Office of Education

JC 690 333

Program With Developing Institutions
1225 Connecticut Ave., N.W. #304
Washington, D.C. 20036

JULY 1969

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

SEP 25 1969

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction iii
Table of Contents v

I. Background of the Program 1

II. Keynote: Flexibility 4

III. Preparatory Steps 6
National Advisory Committee 6
Regional Coordinators 7
Project Staff 7
Initial College Contacts 7
Assembling the Consultant Panel 7
Assignment of Consultants 8
Regional Meetings 9
Publications 10

IV. The Airlie Conference 11

V. The First Round of Consulting 14
Recommendations Made (A Summary) 15
Evaluation By Consultants 18
Evaluation By Colleges 18

VI. The Regional Workshops 19
Evaluation By Participants 19
Summary of Agenda Topics 20
Conclusions Reached 22
Suggestions for Future Workshops 23

VII. The Second Round of Consulting 24
Evaluation By Consultants 24

VIII. Specialized Consulting 25

IX. Specialized Workshops 27
Private Colleges 27
Student Rights and Responsibilities 28
Occupational Education 32
Community and Public Relations 33
Multi-Campus Junior College 33
PWDI Workshop at the AAJC Convention 34
Summary 35

X. Publications Program 36
The Newsletter - Key to Communication 37
Monograph Series 37

XI. Overall Evaluation of Programming By Colleges 38
College Comments on Significant Experiences . . . 38

XII. Conclusions: Implications for the Future 59
Innovations 60
Economical Use of the Dollar 62

APPENDICES

Appendix A: "Questions and Answers" - a Basic Document Describing the 1968-69 Program 67

Appendix B: Listing of Team and Special Consultants to Member Colleges of the Program 71

Appendix C: An Index To the "Developing Junior Colleges" Newsletter - April 1968-June 1969 87

Appendix D: Expenditure of PWDI Funds in 1968-69 Program . . 95

I.

BACKGROUND

OF THE PROGRAM

Early in 1968, when consultants at the U.S. Office of Education were reading applications from junior colleges for funds under Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (for developing institutions), it became apparent that many of the applications were poorly conceived and executed. There was an obvious need for better planning and research as a foundation for applications for institutional aid. Many colleges, in fact, did not seem to know where they were going; a stocktaking of the college's role, and particularly its relationship to the community, was badly needed. Yet the struggling, developing colleges that were most in need of assistance if they were to survive, were often the very ones that lacked the staff and the expertise necessary to do the job that was needed.

To make matters worse, USOE officials realized that the quality of applications was not only poor but getting no better as compared to those of the previous year.

Officials of the Division of College Support in the Bureau of Higher Education, which administers Title III aid, sought a way out of this impasse. Dr. Calvin B.T. Lee, then assistant director of the Division of College Support, asked the advice and assistance of the American Association of Junior Colleges in conversations with Dr. William G. Shannon, the AAJC associate director. The two men discussed the possibility of an extensive type of program which could bring a modest amount of help to many colleges - particularly in the form of expert consultants - to help them to better plan for their own development. This was an unorthodox approach, a departure from the traditional "project" formula, but there was at least one precedent for it. Group aid had been extended to colleges through the Southern Regional Education Board, to meet regional needs. Accordingly, it was determined that the Division of College Support would put together a list of 80 or more colleges which had applied for Title III aid but, for the most part, had not been funded. These colleges, obviously in need of assistance, would be offered the opportunity to participate in a special program to be coordinated by AAJC. An immediate objective of the program would be to induce each of the colleges to take a new look at its role and mission, and thereby improve the quality of its application for aid.

Dr. Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., Executive Director of AAJC, at this point asked Selden Menefee, a writer and educator experienced in junior college administration in California, to come to Washington as a consultant to write the project proposal. This work was begun in early February, 1968.

It was agreed by all concerned that there would be three essential parts to an extensive program:

(1) Consultation, by teams of experts, to help the colleges assess both strengths and weaknesses, and assess their future capabilities.
(2) Conferences and workshops, both national and on a regional basis, to bring the isolated colleges together for the exchange of ideas--and into the mainstream of higher education.
(3) Finally, a program of communication--the dissemination of information through various publications to last throughout the year. A key feature of this would be a newsletter, bringing news of opportunities and progress to all the colleges.

A draft proposal was prepared and discussed in detail with Dr. Willa B. Player, Director of the USOE Division of College Support; her assistant directors, Dr. Calvin B.T. Lee and Dr. Charles Hayes; and Dr. David W. Smith, Jr., education specialist, who was assigned to liason work with AAJC in refining the project.

By mid-March the plan was complete and approved by all concerned. The total amount set aside for the project was $585,000, but because of technical reasons, this could not be allocated to AAJC, an educational organization. Instead twelve colleges, in different regions, were selected to receive the funds, and these in turn contracted with AAJC to supply services to the larger group of colleges. Nearly 20% of the prorated funds stayed with the coordinating colleges to pay the travel costs of colleges in the region; the other 80%, or $473,000, was to be sent on to AAJC, the subcontractor charged with supplying the essential services (consulting, conferences and information).

This packaged plan was offered to 88 junior colleges which had applied for Title III aid and were believed to be in need of such services. Of these, 85 accepted. The other three "opted out," either because they did not consider themselves to be junior colleges or because they did not feel the need for this type of assistance.

The program went into operation on April 1, 1968, only about seven weeks after the detailed planning began--probably a record for any special program of this scope. It was operated for the first two months or more on AAJC funds, until the grants could be sent out to the 12 regional coordinators who then transferred funds to the central (AAJC) office, in June in most cases. Thus only the resources of the AAJC made it possible for the program to be launched as a crash project.

It should be noted here that AAJC brought to the plan for extensive consultation considerable background. In 1960 a special grant was received from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation for a program

of professional consultation, in which AAJC paid the consultants' honoraria for up to two days' consultation but billed expenses to the colleges. Only a relatively small number of colleges used this service, but the groundwork was laid for a wider application of this principle subsequently.

Two workshops to develop the consultative process further were held in 1967. The first, funded by the Pren-Hall Foundation, was a workshop of 47 leading junior college educators "to identify the salient features of the consultative process, and develop a set of guidelines on using and being a consultant." The monograph which resulted was useful in the present program. The second workshop was held in Atlanta with Kellogg Foundation assistance, late in 1967. More than a score of student personnel service officials gathered for a briefing on consultation, and nearly all of these were lafer drafted as PWDI consultants.

The consultation which was the heart of the 1968-69 Program was in some respects built on these experiences.

II.

KEYNOTE: FLEXIBILITY

The original proposal, described briefly in the preceding chapter, had as its principal features a national conference for college representatives and consultants, followed by two months of intensive consulting by teams of experts (from mid-June to mid-August), followed by regional meetings at the end of the summer, revisits by the same teams of consultants in the Fall, further services as needed for the remainder of the year, and a continuous program of publications, printed and/or distributed by the program office all through the year.

This pattern worked out well, but in meeting the needs expressed by the colleges it was expanded far beyond these anticipated features. Individual college needs often led to searches for highly specialized consultants; and group needs were met by having one or two specialized meetings on each of several topics, such as private college problems, student and faculty rights and responsibilities, occupational education, and community and public relations. Each of the funded colleges had at least one paid representative at the AAJC Annual Convention in Atlanta, March 3-7, 1969.

On the publication side, in addition to the newsletter, a copy of the Junior College Journal was sent monthly to each member of the college's professional staff and the governing board, and a basic kit of AAJC publications was sent to every member college. Later a series of monographs was developed, covering the key discussions at the special workshops, printed at low cost by the photo-offset method. Publications printed by the AAJC during the year, and elsewhere as well, were also bought and distributed to the colleges when they were thought to be of general usefulness.

When regional funds were left over because of low travel costs in compact areas, the colleges were encouraged to use their share of the leftover funds for visits to other campuses, or to send staff members who could not otherwise go to professional meetings.

All this increasingly complex set of activities, many of which could not have been foreseen when the original proposal was written, were financed by savings in travel or other budgeted expenses. By putting the needs of the member colleges above all else, and striving to meet these needs in any way possible consistent with the spirit and aims of the program, a climate of good will and cooperation was achieved that would be very difficult to bring about in a program operated by a government agency. As a subcontractor, and service agency to a group of junior colleges, AAJC could achieve this flexibility--even to the point of extending certain free services far beyond the original 85 colleges to over 200 "associate colleges" which had asked in the course of the year to be associated with

the program. (Reimbursement of colleges and consultants was, of course, extended only to the 85 colleges originally funded.)

When the funds of the project began to run low early in 1969, further expansion of project activities had to be curtailed. But there is little doubt that the flexibility of the program and the constant efforts of central staff personnel to meet all possible needs of the colleges as fast as they became known, contributed to the high evaluation ratings given to the program by the colleges.

The program's coat of arms, if it had one, might have featured the slogan "Why not?" Any reasonable suggestion made by a member college, if consistent with the objectives of the program, was respected and implemented by the central office staff.

III.

PREPARATORY STEPS

National Advisory Committee - The first step taken in preparing for actual operation of the Program With Developing Institutions was to select an advisory committee to function at the national level. Care was taken to insure representation of all major regions of the country (but especially the South, where the largest number of member colleges were located); also different levels in the academic establishment (i.e. deans and coordinators as well as college presidents), private colleges, client colleges in the program, state systems, racial minorities and women--all on a committee of seven persons. Not one person who was invited declined to serve. The list of advisors, who met three times during the year, follows:

Dr. Isaac Beckes, President, Vincennes University, Vincennes, Ind.
Dr. Johnnie Ruth Clarke, Asst. Dean of Academic Affairs, St. Petersburg Junior College, St. Petersburg, Florida
Dr. Frederic T. Giles, Dean, College of Education, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington
Mr. H. Deon Holt, Director of Planning and Development, Dallas County Junior College District, Dallas, Texas
Dr. W. Burkette Raper, President, Mount Olive Junior College, Mount Olive, North Carolina
Dr. James L. Wattenbarger, Director, Institute of Higher Education, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida
Dr. Robert Zimmer, President, Kankakee College, Kankakee, Illinois

In addition, Dr. Edmund Gleazer, Executive Director, and Dr. William Shannon, Associate Director of the American Association of Junior Colleges, were considered ex-officio members of the advisory committee, as was Dr. David Smith of the U.S. Office of Education. Later Dr. Alfredo de los Santos of Northampton County Community College in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, and a member of the national advisory group of the entire Title III program, was added as an ex-officio member as well.

The initial meeting of the advisory committee was held in Washington on April 5, 1968, a day and night of intensive rioting in the city following the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Advice was asked and received on the timing of the program (it was found feasible to conduct intensive consulting on campuses in the summer months), on the nature and content of the consulting, and on the organization of national and regional conferences.

The advisory committee next convened at the national conference in June, where they made a great contribution to the workshop sessions; a third time in the Fall, when they were asked to advise on the plans for a second-year program; and not again until March 27, 1969, when a somewhat altered advisory committee met with regional coordinators to plan for the second national conference and a second year's program.

Regional Coordinators - The twelve regional coordinators, who were called in to Washington for a meeting with the officials of the Division of College Support, USOE, also met with the program staff and advisory committee briefly on the afternoon of April 5. The design of the program was explained to them and again there was general agreement that it would be feasible to conduct the first college visits by teams of consultants during the summer vacation period. Many colleges would only be operating with skeleton staffs, and faculty members would be away unless they were teaching in summer school; but on the other hand, the summer period provided an unusual opportunity for administrative staff members to spend considerable time with the visiting consultants.

Project Officers and Staff - Selden Menefee was retained to direct the program. Shafeek Nader, one of the founders of Northwestern Connecticut Community College, was named associate director.

Esperanza Cornejo Alzona served as staff assistant and associate editor of the "Developing Junior Colleges" newsletter. Lee Ann Peterson Focer served as secretary and subsequently staff assistant. Others involved in staff work included John Orcutt, now a junior college specialist with the U. S. Office of Education; Brent Smith, a summer intern; and Mrs. Helen Minifie, secretary.

Initial College Contacts - One of the first actions of the central staff was to write to the president of each funded college and request information on the college (catalogues and brochures) for the Washington office, and extra copies to be sent to consultants later on, prior to their campus visits. Also requested was the name of the campus coordinator of the program, if different from the president, and the number of faculty and staff to whom the Junior College Journal should be sent. This was the beginning of a fruitful correspondence in most cases; it was the usual practice to answer letters from the field the day they were received in Washington.

Assembling the Consultant Panel - The first step in assembling a panel of consultants was to make contact with individuals who would be able to recommend top authorities in the junior college field. Members of the AAJC Washington staff recommended both consultants and recommenders of consultants. The latter included members of the AAJC board and past presidents, whose knowledge of consulting talents was wide; heads of state associations and state directors in states with well-developed community college systems; and a few university people with extensive junior college experience. Letters were sent to the recommenders, stating that three types of experts were needed--on administration and finance, faculty and curriculum, and student personnel services--and that the consulting panel would emphasize junior college leaders, not necessarily at the presidential level but drawing on people at the dean or director level who had unusual specialized knowledge, extensive community college experience and ability to work with people at the campus level.

The result was one of the most unusual panels of consultants ever assembled. Over 90% were junior college personnel, and the others were highly experienced in junior college work. A large number were college presidents, but over half were deans or specialists of various types. There were also certain imbalances: a surplus of administrators, and a shortage of faculty people and of private junior college personnel. These shortages were later corrected.

In the beginning, the plan was to assemble twenty teams of three consultants each and to assign each team to spend three days at each of four colleges. This would cover the 78 mainland colleges and a special team would be sent to cover those in Puerto Rico. But as the recommendations began to pour in, followed by acceptance of invitations to consult by over 90% of those invited to serve, it became apparent that the heavy use of 60 consultants at several colleges each would not be necessary nor would it even be desirable. By the time the assignments were fairly complete, the consultant panel had more than 150 names on it. A year later, with the addition of many specialists and faculty development people, the panel had over 350 names. With such a wealth of talent available, it was reasoned that it would be better to have more consultants visit one or two colleges each, and therefore have a closer relationship with the colleges visited, than to limit the consultants to 60, and assign them on a heavier schedule. Four colleges therefore became the maximum for any one consultant. Several student personnel specialists, from among the top 20 in this field as recommended by Dr. Jane Matson of the Carnegie-financed AAJC Student Personnel Project, visited four colleges each, as did a few faculty specialists; but among the administrators (mostly presidents), who were in plentiful supply, a visit to two colleges was the general rule.

In addition, some outstanding specialists were recruited from outside the active field of higher education from private consulting firms. Some of these could command consultation fees of $250 a day from colleges in private assignments; yet, with one or two exceptions, all those invited agreed to serve the developing colleges at the government rate of $100 a day plus travel and $16 per diem to cover living expenses. Interest in the unusual nature of the project was mainly responsible for the high degree of acceptance, and this made it possible to bring to the colleges talent that they would otherwise never have been able to afford.

Assignment of Consultants - In assigning consultants to colleges, several factors were considered. First, the colleges were queried as to their special consulting needs and the times at which they would be able to receive consultants. The consultants were likewise queried as to their experience in various fields and their available time segments. Then the two were matched, college by college, in a trial and error process, taking the following factors into account:

(1) Matching the available time segments
(2) Fitting special consultant backgrounds to special college needs

(3) Other things being equal, closeness of the consultant to the college was preferred for reasons of (a) convenience and (b) economy

Once a group of consultants had been tentatively assigned, a standard letter was sent out to the college president or coordinator, proposing the team of consultants and suggesting a time for the initial visit. (An effort was made to tie two or more visits together in adjacent time slots for consultants who had to travel long distances--for example, from California to Texas or Iowa--in order to save time for the consultant and money for the program.) Copies of the letter were also sent to the consultants involved, so that they could know that they were being considered. The college administrators were asked to let the central office know immediately if the consultants selected were not satisfactory for any reason, and the consultants were asked to notify the college and Washington office immediately if they could not make the visit if invited. In some cases the proposed dates of visits were changed by direct negotiations between colleges and consultants; in a few instances, the team was split to permit one member to come at a different date, for the convenience of the consultant or college. The overriding consideration was the need for the consultant to get together with his opposite number at the college for detailed consultation.

In over 90% of the cases, the consultants suggested were acceptable to the colleges. In many cases, those who were replaced at the colleges' suggestion were from nearby colleges. (In some instances an outstanding junior college president was nominated as a consultant in another college in the same state. This was often found to be a mistake; the proposed consultant was considered a colleague rather than an expert, and someone from outside the state was preferred.) The staff concluded that to be considered an expert, a person had to come from 100 miles away and from across a state line.

Once the connection was made between colleges and consultants, they communicated directly and were asked only to keep the central office advised as to their arrangements. The colleges made all necessary arrangements to receive the team. Following the initial visit, a team report was sent to the colleges, with a copy to the program office in Washington.

Regional Meetings - While these preparations were going on, one-day drive-in meetings were held in each of the 12 regions. Each one was attended by either the program director or the assistant director from Washington. These meetings, not in the original design of the project, were called by the twelve regional coordinators in late April or May in order to explain the project and answer questions from the member colleges. Such meetings had been requested at the April meeting in Washington. In some cases, the conferees made plans for the late summer regional workshops.

The meetings were largely unstructured and the college representatives were not reimbursed for travel expenses, but attendance was good and general appreciation was expressed that a face-to-face meeting could be held to explain the background and plans for the program.

Publications - Communication was considered a main function of the central office, so a newsletter, "Developing Junior Colleges," was instituted, the first copy appearing April 18, 1968. (In the next year 33 issues appeared, or one about every ten days, bringing news of the program, conferences and colleges to all concerned.) At the outset of the program, a kit of AAJC publications was sent out to each college, for basic reading for staff members whose work related to the subject matter of the booklets. Also, a bundle of Junior College Journals, enough to cover all full-time staff and trustees, was sent to each college during the entire year--May 1968 through May 1969--about 5500 copies of each issue, at the group rate of $1 a year per subscription.

Included in the original kit of publications sent out were the following:

A Bibliography of Doctoral Dissertations on the Junior College, 1964-1966
Junior College Student Personnel Programs: What They Are and What They Should Be
The Privately Supported Junior College--A Place and Purpose in Higher Education
Technical Education in the Junior College/New Programs for New Jobs
A New Social Invention: The Community College, What It Is
An Introduction to American Junior Colleges
Starting a Community Junior College
Member Colleges: American Association of Junior Colleges
Junior College Journal

In addition, all new AAJC publications of general interest were sent out to member colleges as they became available during the year.

IV.

THE AIRLIE CONFERENCE

An essential feature of the program was a national conference to set the tone of the program and prepare for the coming period of intense activity. On the recommendation of AAJC officials, Airlie House, a large conference center in the country near Warrenton, Virginia, was obtained for a three day period at the very end of the school year, June 13-16, just after nearly all the colleges had held their commencement exercises. By ending on Sunday, June 13, it was possible to use part of the weekend in traveling, and get in a full three days.

Except for some confusion in the arrangements for transportation from Washington and from National and Dulles International Airports to Airlie House, the travel arrangements went smoothly. Originally it was planned to have four persons from each funded college attend--the president, a dean, a faculty member and a board member was the preferred formula--but because Airlie House could not accommodate more than 250 persons on a resident basis, this plan was revised to place a limit of three persons per college. Those who came with their families were placed outside Airlie at the motels in Warrenton. Altogether, including about 72 consultants, AAJC staff and USOE officials, some of whom commuted from Washington, about 280 people attended the conference. A majority of the college delegates were presidents or other administrators, some were faculty members and 28 were trustees.

The purpose of the meeting was five-fold: (1) to set the tone for the year's program, (2) to explain the consulting process to both consultants and college officials who would be receiving them, (3) to enable the consultants and college officials to get acquainted and lay some preliminary plans for the coming visits, (4) to enable the colleges to confer again by regions and make plans for the regional conferences in late Summer and Fall, and (5) to bring some substantive new factual material and new concepts in planning for development to the participants involved. A pr file of the conference including selected proceedings is presented in the program's first monograph, "Planning for Development."

The conference was a hard-working one, with sessions morning, afternoon and evening, but there was a general feeling of accomplishment which was reflected in the comments of participants. No formal instrument of evaluation was used, but here are unsolicited comments received afterwards:

> "I do feel the need to express my admiration for you and your staff for the magnificent organization of what now appears to be a monumental undertaking."
>
> -Dr. Dorothy Kearney, Citrus College, Azusa, California

"I wish to express my appreciation for the privilege of participating in the Airlie House Conference. I found it a stimulating affair and one which I am sure will be of great assistance to the developing institutions."

-Lee Henderson, State Dept. of Education, Tallahassee, Fla.

"Accept our hearty thanks for the truly excellent national conference, held at Airlie House and for the opportunity to participate. The meeting was well-planned, the program was stimulating and informative--the session was a 'mountain top' experience."

-Myron Simpson, Dean of Acad. Affairs, Allegany CC, Md.

"Just a note to congratulate you in having planned and carried out a fine conference at Airlie House. It was most useful in clarifying matters for both the consultants and the colleges."

-Dr. Galen Drewry, Director, Institute of Higher Educ.,
University of Georgia, Athens, Ga.

"Your conference at Airlie House was very successful as a result of your planning. There was adequate time and opportunity for college representatives to modify their apprehensions and for consultants to become more sensitive to the problems and concerns and their role in the program. A pleasure to participate."

-Dr. Fred Giles, Dean, School of Educ., U. of Washington

"Airlie House was ideal for study for the various small meetings. The program was well planned. It was very helpful to meet the team of consultants. The various panels and discussions which followed proved quite stimulating. The general sessions which were held were very helpful because both the personnel of HEW and AAJC gave information and ideas which were very much needed in planning for the development of junior colleges in the nation."

-Pres. Horace N. Barker, Hiwassee College, Madisonville,
Tennessee

"You are to be commended for planning a very excellent conference. I appreciated both the program and the fine opportunity to meet so many other educators with mutual interests and problems."

-Joseph F. Jones, Acad. V-P., Michigan Christian College,
Rochester, Michigan

"I was delighted with the opportunity to discuss educational needs and programs with the members of the developing institutions as well as with the 'high-level' group of consultants you had gathered together. I'm sure that a great deal of 'know-how' will emerge from the project.

-Dr. Virginia Keehan, Coordinator, Planning & Development
Chicago City College

"Let me express my hearty thanks for the opportunities to help in your programs and to attend the Airlie House Conference. It was especially helpful, that not only the consultants but the representatives of the colleges could be briefed together prior to our visits to the colleges."

-Mowat G. Fraser, State Dept. of Educ., Hartford, Conn.

"I felt the program was extremely well planned and was of tremendous value. I was especially pleased at the way the logistics of the entire conference were handled."

-Stuart Steiner, Dean of Students, Genesee CC, Batavia, New York

One comment made by several persons was that the conference was so tightly scheduled that only mealtimes were left for socializing. However, with the large amount of work that needed to be done, it was felt that the advantages of a tight schedule outweighed the disadvantages. It was clear from the comments that colleges and consultants did get together as much as they felt necessary, with beneficial results.

V.

THE FIRST ROUND OF CONSULTING

The most important single feature of this project as designed at the outset was the team consulting process. As mentioned earlier, the typical team was to consist of three persons--an administrator who might have some specialities such as finance or facilities, which a particular college would need and he would be selected with this in mind for recommendation to the college; then someone who is in the faculty or curriculum or instructional program would be suggested--such a person would be a faculty member or more typically a dean; and thirdly, a consultant specialist in student personnel services--often a dean of students who has been outstandingly successful. In most instances the specialists in the third group were recommended by Dr. Jane Matson from a group who graduated from a special workshop in consulting in this area held a few months earlier in Atlanta.

In general this team approach, though somewhat experimental, worked out quite well. Most of the colleges made preparations for receiving the team, made appointments for them to interview their opposite members in their various fields and in many cases arranged a general meeting with the faculty. In a few instances, it developed into a sort of faculty workshop for the faculty members of the team. This first visit was typically for three days. It was the longer visit of the two; the return visit being typically two days, although this pattern varied sometimes. If local conditions were such that the team could only work for two days for any reason, then they were instructed to leave after two days, leaving more consulting time open for the college to use later in the year.

The team was instructed to choose its own chairman and a recorder and if possible, with the help of the recorder and the college staff, to complete at least a short report on the consultant visit--what was done, the contacts made, the recommendations given--to be submitted before leaving the campus. This was not always possible to do; the facilities were not always available. Our own house rule was that the consultants could not be paid until they submitted their own evaluation forms on their visit and also the team report. In most cases we stuck to this rule, and as a result the reports came in quite early, right after the consulting visits.

It is not possible to give an adequate digest of consultants' recommendations in this report but an analysis compiled for publication in an early newsletter will be herein presented. A compilation of the first 62 team reports turned in after the first round of consulting showed that there was a definite pattern resulting with the most frequent recommendations to have been: development of more

specific plans for the future; clearer administrative lines of responsibility; more faculty orientation and in-service training; increased student involvement in decision-making; and placing student functions under a Dean of Student Personnel.

Following are the data on 62 colleges with the recommendations classified according to the three consultant areas structured into the program:

Recommendation		Frequency
(ADMINISTRATION, FINANCE, PLANNING, RESEARCH, AND COMMUNITY SERVICES)		
Develop planning		31
(a) Long and/or short range	24	
(b) Facilities	4	
(c) State-wide	3	
Improve administrative organization; span of control; policies and procedures		28
Financial: improve fund raising; explore all sources of income; endowment planning; more state aid;		26
More exploration and use of federal grants: Title III; EOG; work-study; NDSL; facilities; etc.		20
Develop program of institutional research		19
Improve business operations		19
(a) Improve budget preparation	6	
(b) Better business procedures	4	
(c) Preventive maintenance program	4	
(d) Improve purchasing procedures	3	
(e) Use data processing equipment	2	
Define philosophy, role and objectives of the college		18
Increase involvement with the community		16
More inter-institutional cooperation		16
(a) Cooperate with nearby 2-year colleges	7	
(b) Cooperate with nearby 4-year colleges	6	
(c) Consortiums	3	
Improve internal and external communication		9
More community services		9
Delineate administrative job responsibilities		8
Board of Trustees		8
(a) Codify policies	3	
(b) President to inform them of role	3	
(c) Should have local autonomous board	2	
Improve public relations		7
Study data processing for total college use		5
More secretarial staff		4
More college involvement with industry		4
Determine student clientele		4
President should determine decision priorities		3
Develop wide spectrum of summer programs		2

Recommendation		Frequency
(FACULTY AND CURRICULUM)		
Faculty development program needed		31
(a) In-service training, conference attendance	18	
(b) Orientation	13	
Develop remedial (developmental) programs		20
Improve occupational program		17
(a) More programs	15	
(b) More staff time to develop programs	2	
Improve learning resources		16
(a) Develop learning resources center	8	
(b) More and better use of educational media	8	
More faculty involvement		16
(a) In college affairs	5	
(b) With curriculum	5	
(c) In planning	6	
Improve or clarify faculty evaluation process		11
Establish and use curriculum advisory committees		11
Develop or improve core (general education) program		10
More curriculum and course up-dating and evaluation		10
Improve faculty salaries and benefits		10
Use curriculum feasibility studies		9
Establish or reorganize divisions		9
Formalize faculty committee structure		8
Library improvement		6
(a) Strengthen	4	
(b) Better planning	1	
(c) More professional affiliations	1	
Curriculum innovation		6
Develop continuing education and/or summer school program		6
Use consultants		6
Unify occupational and transfer programs		4
Establish a faculty organization		4
Review departmental structure and role of chairmen		4
Eliminate course duplication and proliferation		4
Establish program for the disadvantaged		3
Establish non-degree certificate program		3
More curriculum planning and development		3
Hire occupational education director		3
Experiment with team teaching		2
Reduce teaching loads		2
Employ laboratory assistants		2
(STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES)		
Increase student involvement		27
(a) Place students on college committees	13	
(b) Increase student involvement in the college	5	
(c) Involve students in policy formation	4	

Recommendation		Frequency
(d) Student involvement in discipline	3	
(e) Involve students in dormitory operation	2	
Organize student personnel services under a dean of students; specify staff responsibilities		22
Increase counseling services		19
Provide adequate staff		19
Better liason with high schools		13
Develop and strengthen student activities program		13
Provide health services		9
Expand recruitment of students		7
Involve students in the community (use EPIC model)		6
Improve student orientation		6
Professional in placement office		4
Professional development for SPS staff		4
Expand services		4
Better alumni follow-up		4
Clarify admissions policy		4
Strengthen student government		4
Put financial aid under SPS		3
Use data processing for records		3
Upgrade SPS in college hierarchy		3
Develop SPS philosophy and functions		3
Develop procedures to protect student rights and hear student grievances		3
Develop dormitories as living-learning centers		3
Records supervised by SPS staff		2
SPS planning		2
Re-evaluate SPS		2
SPS staff involved in curriculum revision		2
Provide statistical report on students		2
More scholarships		2
Better SPS staff communication with faculty		2
Definite role of faculty advisor		2
Improve dormitories		2
Develop policy on release of information about students		2
Provide dormitory counselors		2
Establish student activity hour		2
Provide student lounges		2

An evaluation of the consultant visits by the colleges will also be of interest. The final evaluations showed that of 85 colleges whose presidents or coordinators for this project were asked, "How valuable to the college was the team consulting visit process?" 40 replied "very valuable," giving it a top rating. 37 more said "of considerable value," giving it the second highest rating. Only eight replied "some value" which we considered a mediocre rating and nobody said "little value" or "no value." So on a five-point scale, 77 out of 85 colleges reported one of the top two ratings--"very valuable" or

"of considerable value." The initial summer visit turned out to have been considered more valuable than the return visit in the Fall by a slight majority of member colleges. 48 colleges said the initial summer visit was "more valuable;" 40 said the return Fall visit was the "more valuable," three colleges apparently having considered the visits to have been of equal value.

For the initial visits the consultants were asked to evaluate their own effectiveness on a five-point scale and also to postulate the value the team visit had for the college. The colleges in turn were asked to assign to the individual consultant a value on the five-point scale and also to evaluate the value of the team visit itself to the college. Results that are for the most part complete are shown in the following tables:

EVALUATION BY CONSULTANTS

	Personal Value	Value of Team
Very Valuable	64	97
Considerable Value	137	108
Some Value	34	30
Little Value	0	0
No Value	0	0

compiled from the reports of 235 visits

EVALUATION BY COLLEGES

	Value of Consultant	Value of Team
Very Valuable	139	49
Considerable Value	91	30
Some Value	23	4
Little Value	3	1
No Value	0	0

compiled from 256 visits to 84 of 85 colleges, including six of the seven member colleges in Puerto Rico

From the tabulated information it is thus possible to make some inferences. The consultants felt their visit to have been of great value but considered the impact of the team as a whole to have been greater. The colleges as a whole were more generous in their appraisal of the initial consultation. In attempting to correlate the evaluations of both consultants and college officials it is interesting to note that the ratings coincided only 38% of the time. In 47% of all cases the consultants received a higher rating from the colleges than they had given themselves. In the remaining 15% of the cases the consultants were deemed not as valuable as they had judged themselves to be. The results of the evaluations point to a measureable degree of success in this initial stage of the project.

VI.

THE REGIONAL WORKSHOPS

An important part of the design for this project was workshops for the colleges in each region where the colleges themselves would determine what subject matter they wanted covered. With the help of the central office, the regional coordinators would organize two-day workshops. These were structured into the schedule after the summer consulting was practically completed and were intended to take place before school started so as not to interfere with the beginning of the school year. This put them between August 15th and September 15th.

The format of each regional meeting was planned primarily by the regional coordinator with the advice and assistance of the colleges and the assistance of the central office. In some cases the workshops were planned in considerable detail, such as the one for the Midwest region. Others were only lightly structured, with sessions designated for workshop discussions of administration, faculty and student problems, such as the one for the North Plain States region in Minneapolis. It could be said from the differential ratings given by the participants in the various meetings that overstructuring such meetings proved to be a mistake. Free discussions and questions and answers during the meetings added greatly to their interest and effectiveness. In fact, the most effective meeting was the one most lightly structured--the one held in Minneapolis. One of the least successful meetings was that held in Chicago, which was very tightly structured with the participants designated in advance. The one in Seattle for the West Coast region was also not very effective because the participants there enjoyed the resort vacation atmosphere, apparently not taking full advantage of workshop sessions. The differential ratings for the twelve regional workshops are presented in the following table:

SUMMARY OF FALL '68 REGIONAL WORKSHOP EVALUATIONS BY COLLEGE REPRESENTATIVES

REGION	No. of College Reps. Reporting*	#1	#2	Per Cent**
1. North Atlantic States	19	7	5	63%
2. The Carolinas	23	7	12	81%
3. Georgia - Florida	31	12	15	87%
4. Alabama - Tennessee	27	19	8	100%
5. Mississippi - Arkansas	22	10	11	95%
6. Kentucky	25	12	11	92%
7. Michigan - Illinois - Indiana	29	11	13	82%
8. Iowa - Minnesota - Dakotas	33	24	7	93%
9. Kansas - Missouri - Colorado	35	10	20	85%
10. Oklahoma - Texas	31	21	10	100%
11. Washington - California	15	2	5	47%
12. Puerto Rico	9	3	5	88%

*includes associate college representatives
**per cent reporting the two highest ratings (5-point scale)

The regional workshops were also open to participation of the program's associate colleges and were thus extremely valuable in bringing together member and associate colleges for cross-fertilization of ideas. A total of 56 associate colleges joined the 85 member colleges in the workshop sessions; the Georgia-Florida meet was attended by 10 associate colleges, and 14 were at the workshop held by the Kansas - Colorado - Missouri region.

It would here be appropriate to review briefly the agenda topics and results of each workshop:

1. North Atlantic States

Held at Friendship International Airport near Baltimore, the workshop focused on the components of "good teaching" and on student involvement in college operation and policy. The presence of students livened the proceedings.

2. The Carolinas

The Carolinas Workshop, held at Montreat, North Carolina, featured a description of cooperative programs by Galen Drewry and a presentation by John Roueche on available resources to junior colleges. Definite ideas emerged on the use of learning devices and methods in the region.

3. Georgia - Florida

This workshop, held at Pine Mountain, Georgia, ambitiously undertook to cover many of the problems covering the junior college today. A consortium of 20 colleges, including members and associates, was formed to apply for an EPDA grant, and plans were laid for a second conference to focus on "Governance of the Community/Junior College."

4. Alabama - Tennessee

Discussion at this workshop, held in Huntsville, Alabama, was centered on the three major subdivisions of the program--administration, faculty and curriculum, and student personnel services. The idea for a subsequent conference for private junior colleges (see Chapter 9) originated at this workshop.

5. Mississippi - Arkansas

Participants at this meet in Jackson, Mississippi, judged the session on developing an administration organizational plan to have been the most valuable. Other sessions highlighted the need for implementation of student personnel programs and for greater involvement of students in college functions.

6. Kentucky

The Kentucky workshop held at Lexington achieved monumental success in the creation of a statewide consortium involving both public and private two-year institutions. Areas of involvement for the consortium were identified and the date for a future meeting was set.

7. Michigan - Illinois - Indiana

Held on the eve of the Democratic Convention in Chicago, this conference involved college participants on structured panels to discuss along with the consultants the areas of community relations, educational technology, finance and articulation with high schools and higher institutions of learning.

8. Iowa - Minnesota - The Dakotas

This workshop in Minneapolis was left relatively unstructured beforehand and a good deal of lively discussion that proved to be fruitful resulted. Glenn Gooder of Los Angeles City College highlighted the discussion by emphasizing the need of junior colleges to start over in building the needs of the student into the courses of study.

9. Kansas - Colorado - Missouri

Held in Kansas City, Missouri, this workshop was well attended, including a large number of associate colleges in relevant aspects of the project. Special sessions were held for administrators, faculty and student services personnel and for trustees. The role of the consultant was emphasized in addresses and panel discussions.

10. Oklahoma - Texas

A consortium of South Texas junior colleges was organized on a preliminary basis at this workshop held in Shawnee, Oklahoma. The Oklahoma colleges attending formulated plans for a conference to form a statewide consortium. The program was broadly structured, covering many areas of vital interest to junior college personnel.

11. Washington - California

Small informal discussion groups were programmed for this workshop held at Lake Wilderness, near Seattle. A second workshop on "Planning for Improved Learning Services in the Community College" was planned, as well as a meeting to discuss formation of a consortium in the state of Washington.

12. Puerto Rico

The Puerto Rico regional workshop was the culmination of two weeks of consulting on the island. Nearly all of the island's two-year colleges and regional centers were represented. A review of the consultants' findings was made and discussion was focused on coordination of Puerto Rico's public and private junior college systems and cooperative efforts for the efficient utilization of limited resources. A second regional workshop was planned for September to focus on occupational education.

Conclusions Reached

At the regional meetings, the college representatives and consultants reached parallel conclusions in many cases, almost amounting to a concensus among our member institutions on certain common needs for the future. These stand out in retrospect:

(1) There is a general need for simplifying administration by adopting a more precise organization chart, reducing the number of persons reporting to the president to three or so, to leave him more time for planning and developmental programs. There is also a need for better business and purchasing procedure in many colleges.

(2) There is a need for allocating responsibility for planning and fund raising, and for institutional research, to one person each, if only on a part-time basis.

(3) Many colleges need to develop and adopt a clear statement of philosophy and policy.

(4) There is a prevalent need for programs of faculty orientation in the philosophy and objectives of the junior or community college, and for faculty in-service training in some specialized areas such as remedial, occupational and adult education. This need was met to some extent by the use of our returning teams of consultants in faculty workshops, as well as by special consultants assigned to the member colleges at their own request; but much more is needed along this line.

(5) Enlargement of occupational curricula in community colleges (and in some private colleges) was recommended.

(6) There was general agreement that artificial barriers between transfer and occupational programs should be lowered, and the two fields brought closer together under a common Dean of Instruction as soon as possible.

(7) There is a common need for developmental programs for the educationally-handicapped and for adults in the community.

(8) Community relations can be improved in most cases, by community surveys of the need for occupational programs, campus programs which bring people to the college, and better public relations and intra-community cooperation.

(9) Many colleges need assistance in development of learning centers using modern audiovisual techniques. Special consultants in this field are much in demand.

(10) There is a need for more faculty and student participation in the decision-making process, wherever it is appropriate, in order to improve morale on the campus and enlist the talents of all parts of the academic community in college development.

(11) There is a prevalent need, especially in the smaller colleges, for more adequate student personnel programs. One common recommendation by the consultants was that all student-service functions and student activities be placed under a Dean of Student Personnel Services who would report directly to the president of the college.

Suggestions for Future Workshops

A number of suggestions were made by participants both at the workshops and on the evaluation forms as to how such workshops could be better conducted in the future. Many such suggestions were implemented in future planning. A digest of some of the most frequently made suggestions appears herein:

(1) There should be far more faculty and student involvement on panels, not limiting them to administrators.

(2) There should be more small group discussions on specific topics or problems of individual colleges and ample time for dialogue.

(3) There is a need for defining terms and for receiving advance materials before the workshops.

(4) A balance should be maintained between: formal presentations, group discussions and free time for the exchange of ideas.

(5) There could be a more clear-cut presentation of ideas by experts rather than general group discussions.

(6) The sessions should be slanted more toward problem solving, not only the identification of the problems.

(7) There should be more dissemination of information on federal aid available to junior colleges and the most effective use of this aid.

(8) Consultants should be prepared in advance and bring hand-outs and more specific ideas to generate discussion.

(9) More time should be allotted questions and answers sessions.

(10) Provision for individual consultation could be made at the workshop or for college officials to meet informally with consultants.

(11) There should be more participation in such workshops by trustees, staff, faculty and students.

(12) Records of the sessions could be published and mailed out to participant colleges.

(13) There should be more demonstrations involving instructional media in showing actual success.

(14) Shorter sessions would hold audience interest to the end.

VII.

THE SECOND ROUND OF CONSULTING

The second round of consulting got under way shortly after the regional conferences and was run off between September and November for the most part, with a very few exceptions. Individuals who could not come at that time came a little later, some as late as January, such as the consultants who returned to Puerto Rico.

The original team of three consultants returned in most cases. They had the background which they had acquired in the earlier summer visit and came back to try to be of further use to the colleges. We had one unexpected dividend. Many of the colleges requested that consultants meet with faculty and conduct faculty workshops. So they were there not only to advise the administration; their services were used in faculty workshops and these workshops proved quite successful. At Southwest Texas Junior College, for example, the team conducted a full-scale faculty workshop. The college was closed for this period and the consultants took over, resulting in a very successful session. Something like this happened on a lesser scale at many colleges.

The final evaluation of the program later in the year indicated, as we noted earlier, that return visits in the Fall were rated "most valuable" by slightly fewer college presidents and coordinators, but the overall team consulting process was, as we noted before, considered "very valuable" or "of considerable value" by 77 of the 85 colleges.

An evaluation of the revisits by the consultants revealed the feeling that the follow-up visit had been valuable but the ratings given were not as high as after the initial visit. The ratings of the second visit by the consultants are given in the following table:

EVALUATION BY CONSULTANTS (Revisit)

	Personal Value	Team Value
Very Valuable	43	56
Considerable Value	100	97
Some Value	34	20
Little Value	2	3
No Value	0	0
compiled from:	179 reports	176 reports

VIII.

S P E C I A L I Z E D C O N S U L T I N G

Because of savings at the Airlie Conference and in travel arrangements for the consultants, additional funds became available which could be used for additional consulting time. In the course of the team consulting process, many highly specialized needs, ranging from new methods of teaching developmental English and math to problems such as how to manage student unions and how to set up organization and rules for a new dormitory (the latter in Port Angeles, Washington), were brought to the attention of the central office.

It was determined that up to 17 days of consulting time could be supplied without running over the budget and the colleges were so notified. In some cases the central office suggested the need for additional visits by more specialized consultants after reading the reports and recommendations of the consulting teams. In other cases the request came from the college. We attempted in every case to meet the needs of the college up to the quota of 17 man-days, and in a few exceptional cases even 18 days when we found that other colleges were not using their full quota of consulting time. We were able by so doing to bring special services to the colleges, and these were appreciated.

By January, when the general evaluation was sent out, the question was included, "Have you had the services of any additional specialized consultants?" 55 colleges replied "Yes," 20 said "No." Of these 55 who said "Yes," we asked "How valuable was this additional specialized consultation?" 31 said "very valuable," 17 said "of considerable value," 6 said "some value" and there were none lower on the five-point scale. Of the 30 who replied "No," 22 said they expected to get such services before the end of the project. Only 8 indicated that they did not expect to have such services, presumably because they did not need them. So, we know from the evaluation that this specialized consulting was very well received and very useful to the colleges.

The varied nature of the specialized consultation is reflected in a few examples that it would be appropriate at this point to cite. In regard to the aforementioned dormitory planning at Peninsula College, Port Angeles, Washington, two consultants in the immediate area were engaged to make a special visit to the campus; Charles Abshire, Director of Student Personnel at Yakima Valley College and C. Weston Hatch of North Idaho Junior College at Coeur d'Alene. In a communication shortly thereafter to the central office, Peninsula College added that they "were very pleased with the services that they provided us."

In similar arrangements Gordon Starr, a student union specialist at the University of Minnesota, visited Lake Region Junior College,

Devil's Lake, North Dakota, to consult on student union management with specific reference to the areas of food service, bookstore operation, recreational operations and supervision of students, all areas identified by the college. Mr. Starr later visited Bismarck Junior College and Dodge City Community Junior College in a similar capacity. Mobile State Junior College, requesting help in the area of cooperative education, received the services of Dr. Richard Steele of Antioch (Ohio) who had expertise in research and development and practical experience in the inauguration of work-study programs.

The above incidents serve as examples of how specialized consultation was directly tailored to the needs of the individual colleges. A detailed listing of specialized consulting services rendered all member colleges as well as a listing of the consulting teams to each college, is contained in Appendix B.

IX.

S P E C I A L I Z E D W O R K S H O P S

During the early part of the year, at the regional workshops and in the consultants' visits, there emerged certain basic needs for group consultation which we tried to satisfy by organizing a whole series of specialized workshops where large numbers of member and associate college representatives could come together on a fairly economical basis. The regional basis would have been too small in size; this would have meant repeating each specialized workshop twelve times. The most we felt we could do would be two for each specialized are--dividing the area covered by the member colleges into either North and South or East and West.

The following areas were covered by specialized workshops:

Private Colleges

This workshop originated out of the request by five Tennessee private college presidents for a special conference in this area, dealing especially with the financial needs of the private college and how they might be met by more adequate development policies and student recruitment policies. One of these presidents, Dr. Ernest Stockton of Cumberland College of Tennessee, offered to host such a meeting. In the visit which followed the regional meeting in Alabama, we learned that Cumberland College could actually play host to a considerably larger group, so it was decided to take all private colleges west of the Appalachians and invite them to send up to two people to a special workshop at the expense of the project. The central office undertook to arrange the program, gathering outstanding talent--both college and private consultants, and people from both two-year colleges and universities who were experienced in meeting the problems of the private junior college.

The meeting was so successful according to the evaluation given by the participants who attended the conference in Lebanon, Tennessee, September 27-28, that 29 out of the 32 participating rated the conference "very valuable," and the other three rated it "of considerable value." These results were so outstanding that we felt it would be only fair to repeat this experiment at a college on the Atlantic coast to accommodate the colleges in the Carolinas and all up and down the coast--both member and associate colleges. So it was done again on November 1-2, at Montreat-Anderson College in North Carolina. This workshop did not get such a high rating but 24 out of the 36 returning evaluation forms said that it was "very valuable" with the other 12 estimating it to have been "of considerable value."

Another result of these conferences was a second monograph (the first having been the selected proceedings of the Airlie

Conference) in the Program With Developing Institutions series, entitled "The Private Junior College - Problems and Solutions," and this was received very well by the private colleges. This monograph was sent to all private junior colleges in the country as well as to all participants in the two workshops, and was later made available at conferences and workshops to a still broader audience.

Student Rights and Responsibilities

As an outgrowth of the discussion at the Kentucky regional workshop in September, Dr. Isaac Beckes, President of Vincennes University, Vincennes, Indiana, offered to host a panel discussion on "Student Rights and Responsibilities." After consultation with the central office, it was agreed that he might select from the member and a few associate colleges as well (who could attend at their own expense), a panel of a dozen colleges, ranging from smalltown or rural areas to big city junior colleges, and invite each of them to send a faculty member or dean of students and one student from each college, making a total of 24 panel members at the conference.

It was felt that in an extended weekend conference at Vincennes, a group this size might reach a fairly good consensus on the areas in which students should have decision-making power, areas in which they should have advisory power, and areas in which they should at least be informed on what is going on in policy formation on the campus. This was done and some top student consultants including Dr. Jane Matson, Dr. John Davitt, Dr. Richard C. Richardson, Jr., Head of the AAJC Commission on Student Personnel Policy, and Jack Orcutt of the central office attended this meeting, December 6-8.

The actual value of the conference according to the participants was as follows: 20 deemed it "very valuable," 10 said "of considerable value" and 7 said "some value." None were lower. The number of evaluations exceeded 24 because a number of associate colleges attended at their own expense. This conference did reach a consensus on many points as shown by the table reproduced on the following page, which was reprinted in the newsletter and in a slightly different form in the Junior College Journal.

Our own evaluation of this conference was that it may well have stimulated colleges to encourage student participation in policy formation and thereby may have headed off some troubles on campus which otherwise might have occurred and did occur, in fact, on some campuses in the school year 1968-69. We felt that we were helping the junior colleges to get a little ahead of the pressure and to introduce student participation in policy-making before confrontations occurred.

STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE JUNIOR COLLEGE

(Results of a voting panel of 24 members at the Vincennes Workshop)

1. What is the relationship that should exist between the student and the two-year college?

   (a) A relationship whereby the institution (faculty, students, administration and community) establishes the purposes and minimum standards necessary to insure the existence of an ordered system with academic freedom, and relies upon the judgment of the students with respect to whether or not they accept those standards and ideals that do not infringe upon the rights of others within the institution. 19

   (b) A relationship in which decisions are made by those members of the academic community best fitted and/or most affected after formal consideration of the views of all segments. 3

   (c) A relationship whereby the institution establishes the minimum standards necessary to insure the existence of an ordered system and relies upon the culture of the community (in the broad sense) from which the student comes to determine mores. 1

   (d) A relationship whereby the institution establishes standards and ideals, makes these standards and ideals clear to those whom it admits, but relies upon the judgment of the student with respect to whether or not they accept those standards and ideals that do not infringe upon the rights of others within the academic community. 1

   (e) An authority relationship similar to that which exists between parents, and sons and daughters in a family situation (sometimes referred to as *in loco parentis*) 0

2. What should be the relative status of the administration, faculty and students in the two-year college?

   (a) There should be a college community approach to all matters that involve the three groups, but the approach should be so structured that students have at least an equal voice in matters that affect them most directly. . . . 15

   (b) There should be a college community approach to all matters involving the three groups, but the approach should be so structured that students have primary voice in the matters that affect them most directly. 8

   (c) The administration, faculty and students should each have an equal voice in matters that affect all three groups. . . 1

   (d) The administration and faculty should have the deciding voice in some decisions affecting the college community while students should have the deciding voice in other areas. . 0

   (e) The administration and faculty should have the deciding vote in all decisions affecting the college community. . . 0

3. To what extent should students be involved in the following areas: (1) not at all (2) some student involvement (3) equal student involvement (4) primarily under student leadership (5) totally under student leadership	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
a. Faculty appointments	7	17	0	0	0
b. Faculty reappointments, promotion to higher rank and tenure	1	19	3	1	0
c. Student publications	0	0	1	12	11
d. Admissions standards for curricula and courses	1	21	2	0	0
e. Class size	0	21	3	0	0
f. Allocation of instructional funds	0	20	2	2	0
g. Allocation of student activity fees	0	1	4	5	14
h. Curricula or course addition, revision or deletion	0	14	10	0	0
i. Administrative structure of the college	2	20	2	0	0
j. Staff salaries, fringe benefits	7	16	1	0	0
k. Teaching loads	5	15	4	0	0
l. Student conduct and discipline not directly related to classroom situations	0	1	5	9	9
m. Provision of services to the community	0	10	14	0	0
n. Recognition of campus student organizations	0	0	1	9	14
o. Approval of guest speakers invited by students	0	1	2	7	14
p. Alterations in the college calendar	0	12	12	0	0
q. Coordination and approval of co-curricular activities	0	2	14	8	0
r. Requirements for degrees and certificates	1	20	2	1	0
s. Selection of the president	5	16	3	0	0
t. Selection of college officials related to students, e.g., dean of students	2	13	9	0	0
u. Distribution of student-initiated literature on campus	0	0	5	9	10
v. Distribution of off-campus literature on campus	2	0	7	9	6

4. Students should be guaranteed by action of the governing board the following rights and freedoms as defined in the joint statement on rights and freedoms:	(yes)	(no)	(don't know)
a. Freedom of expression in the classroom	24	0	0
b. Protection against improper academic evaluation	24	0	0
c. Protection against improper disclosure on the basis of classroom expression	24	0	0
d. Confidentiality of student records	24	0	0
e. Freedom of association	22	0	2
f. Freedom of inquiry and expression in student organization	24	0	0
g. Freedom of expression in student publications	24	0	0
h. Freedom to exercise the rights of citizenship	24	0	0
i. Guarantee of procedural due process in disciplinary proceedings	24	0	0
j. Freedom of a student's access to his own records	21	1	2
k. Freedom to pursue one's own cultural identity	19	1	4

5. Students should be expected to actively accept responsibilities where an atmosphere conducive to real student participation exists, and where there are channels open to students to express their concerns with the same sort of integrity as other members of the college community:	(yes)	(no)	(don't know)
a. Compliance with and support of duly constituted civil authority	18	3	3
b. Respect for the rights of others and cooperation to insure that such rights are guaranteed whether or not the views are consistent with their own	24	0	0
c. Cooperation to insure that the will of the majority is implemented after due consideration has been given to contrary points of view, but not to include the suppression of minority points of view	23	0	1
d. The exercise of dissent in a responsible manner and within a framework compatible with the orderly resolution of differences	17	4	3
e. Active support of college regulations established through the joint efforts of students, faculty and administrators	15	5	4
f. The exercise of dissent within a framework compatible with the resolution of differences	20	2	2
g. Knowledge of college regulations established through the joint efforts of students, faculty and administrators	21	2	1

6. There should be an exchange of representation between students, faculty and administration on senates, committees, and councils, with students serving on faculty and administrative policy-formulating bodies and with faculty and administration serving on student policy-formulating bodies . . . . . unanimous in assent

7. The recommendations of a representative student government or recognized student groups in areas defined as appropriate for student involvement and as set forth in question #3 should be:

a. Reported to appropriate officers or committees in the institutional implementing processes, but afforded a hearing by the governing body, at which students are represented, when all other channels have been exhausted without satisfactory disposition in the minds of those who made the initial recommendation 22
b., c., d., amd e (Reported to the dean of students or faculty advisor; the president; governing board at the discretion of the president or in all instances) . . 0
f. No answer 2

The 12 colleges in the voting panel were:
Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College, Tifton, Georgia
Alice Lloyd College, Pippa Passes, Kentucky
Belleville Junior College, Belleville, Illinois
Wilson Campus of the Chicago City College, Illinois
Joliet Junior College, Joliet, Illinois
Macomb County Community College, Warren, Michigan
Meramec Community College, St. Louis, Missouri
Mount Olive Junior College, Mount Olive, North Carolina
North Florida Junior College, Madison, Florida
Paducah Junior College, Paducah, Kentucky
St. Catharine College, St. Catharine, Kentucky
Vincennes University, Vincennes, Indiana

Occupational Education

There was great interest in occupational education and many suggestions were received from member colleges asking for a workshop in this field. Agreement was reached with the Occupational Education Project of AAJC to jointly sponsor two such workshops--one in the North and one in the South. They were scheduled for Gainesville, Florida, February 14-15, and East Lansing, Michigan, February 21-22. Almost identical programs were planned, the heart of which was to be the participation of AAJC's four top authorities in the occupational field--Kenneth Skaggs, Director and Specialist in Health-Related

Occupational Programs; Lewis Fibel, Specialist on Science and Engineering Technology Programs; Gilbert Saunders, Specialist on Business-Related and Data Processing Programs; and James Stinchcomb, Specialist on Public Service and Law Enforcement Programs.

Ratings on these two meetings were not as high as those on the earlier private college workshops, but a great deal of value was noted by many participants. Again a publication, "Occupational Education in the Junior College," resulted from the two workshops combined. Looking at the ratings, 85% of those attending the Florida workshop, and 95% of those attending the Michigan one, evaluated the meetings as either "very valuable" or "of considerable value" on the five-point scale.

Community and Public Relations

Another field in which there was wide interest in specialized workshop activity was community service and public relations. These fields were combined in a second pair of workshops which were arranged in cooperation with the Community Service Project of AAJC (funded by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation). Dr. J. Kenneth Cummiskey of this project helped to arrange this program and financed, through his project, the travel and fees of consultants who were invited to attend. The workshops were held at San Antonio and Moline, Illinois.

The evaluation of these two meetings is as follows:

	San Antonio	Moline
Number of Evaluations Returned	43	40
Ratings:		
1. Very valuable	18	19
2. Considerable value	20	17
3. Some value	4	4
4. Little value	1	0
5. No value	0	0

Again a publication, "Community Relations and Services in the Junior Colleges," resulted from these two meetings, as #4 of the PWDI series.

The Multi-Campus Junior College

A small "group consultation" was held on "The Problems of the Multi-Campus Junior College" in Davenport, Iowa, on April 24-26. This was arranged primarily for five member colleges of the Program With Developing Institutions which were involved in or expected to have to face the problems of a multi-campus orgainization. These were Macomb County Community College, in Michigan, whose president, John Dimitry, agreed to do much of the preparatory work for this session; the Clinton and Muscatine campuses of Eastern Iowa Community College, whose superintendent, Robert Johnson, had agrred to be co-chairman of the conference along with Dr. Dimitry; Ellsworth College which

was one campus in a multi-campus district at Iowa Falls, Iowa and Kansas City Kansas Community Junior College which is about to build a second campus. Many others attended this meeting at their own expense, coming from as far away as Everett, Washington to join the discussions. All in all, 45 representatives of 26 colleges in 10 states and Puerto Rico attended. All those who filled out evaluation forms rated the conference either "very valuable" or "of considerable value."

There was a general consensus at the meet that the maximum of automony practicable is desirable as a new campus develops. In California, the multi-college rather than multi-campus system predominates; but all districts must decide which course best meets their needs. It was felt that further research is needed to determine the effects of different sites (central city and suburban), off-campus centers, and dispersed (store-front) classrooms in the urban district.

In summarizing the sessions, President Murray Block of Manhattan Community College in New York City made the following points:

(1) Clarity of administrative functions is essential as an urban district grows more complex. Clear lines of organizational authority are needed.

(2) The form of organization will have to adapt to state laws and to local needs.

(3) Don't be misled by terms like "autonomy." There must be a compromise between central and campus authority.

(4) We are going to have more and more multi-campus operations, and they will require strong, central supportive services.

(5) Freedoms and controls need to be in balance in a multi-campus district.

(6) Organization charts can only be a guide--a jumping-off point for actual administration.

(7) These are troubled times. We need to approach changes with caution. Watch your statements, so they won't be misunderstood. Consult frequently with your colleagues.

(8) Collective bargaining will have a great effect on multi-campus organization. It will force tighter administration, definition of relationships and more centralization.

(9) On race, a major question in multi-unit (city) districts is segregation. We have oscillated from segregation to integration to segregation. We have a responsibility to integrate, especially in the two-year college. We must treat new "apartheid" moves as a phase.

(10) Finally, we must remember we are first of all an agency for students. Their needs are of paramount importance.

FWDI Workshop at the 1969 AAJC Convention

Finally, it should be mentioned that a one-day workshop was held prior to and in conjunction with the AAJC Convention on March 3rd in Atlanta.

A case history of the consulting process was presented in the morning sessions. College representatives and consultants to Ottumwa Heights College (Iowa), Harford Junior College (Maryland), and Southern Union State Junior College (Alabama) shared in the presentation of the case histories. Sister Muriel Hogan, President of Ottumwa Heights College, stated that "the Program With Developing Institutions was an important event for us....a stimulus to our college." W. Burkette Raper, consultant to Ottumwa Heights and President of Mount Olive Junior College in North Carolina, noted that the "credit for what was done really belongs to the staff of the college who were ready for the consultants and knew how to use them."

A second morning session involved a panel of consultants and members of the advisory committee in a discussion on the effects of the program. Glenn Gooder, President of Los Angeles City College and consultant for a number of member colleges, said that "we are all developing institutions." Several consultants noted that the colleges by virtue of their involvement in the project were actually learning from each other.

A luncheon address by Troy Eslinger, President of Lees Junior College in Kentucky, on "Consortium Building," was followed by afternoon sessions featuring a speaker from USOE, Dr. Paul Carnell of the Division of College Support, who commented favorably on the success of the program. A report on the first year's program and the plans for 1969-70 was given by the program director. A visit to nearby DeKalb College culminated the day's activities.

A subsequent session of the AAJC Convention itself featured a brief report by the program director and presentations on the consulting process at Vincennes University and St. Gregory's College.

Summary

It is the feeling of the central office staff that the specialized workshops, held at places and times reasonably convenient to the colleges involved, were of real value to the program, although not included in the original design.

X.

PUBLICATIONS PROGRAM

At the outset of the program copies of AAJC publications which were currently available and which it was felt would be of value to the member colleges, were sent to all of the 85 members. It was also determined that the budget would permit bundle subscriptions of the Junior College Journal which were made available at the low rate of $1 per year. A questionnaire was sent to all member colleges asking them how many Journals they would need to cover all faculty, full-time administrators, and up to seven trustees. All through the year, starting in May 1968 and ending with May 1969, these bundles of Journals were sent out. The final evaluation of the program indicated a great value placed on receiving the Journals. Some 50 colleges said that they were "very valuable," 27 said "of considerable value," 4 of "some value" and only one rated it as of "little value." Most of the colleges renewed their bundle orders in the Fall of 1969, though this was no longer funded.

As time went on we sent a number of special mailings of booklets which we purchased such as an AAJC monograph on "Junior College Institutional Research"; a publication from the University of Georgia Institution of Higher Education by Galen Drewry, entitled "The Administrative Team," which was rated as "very valuable" by 31 of the colleges; and "A Guide to Public Relations for Junior Colleges" which was obtained free from the publisher who printed it on a special $10,000 grant from the Standard Oil Company of California. "Ten Thousand and Under," a monograph published by AAJC for colleges in small towns and rural areas was sent also to all our member colleges who fell into this category. The book "This is Your Community College" by Dr. Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., was also sent to all member and associate colleges in our program in the paperback edition, which was purchased in quantity at a special reduced price.

Finally, during the year, the director and Jack Orcutt of the PWDI staff (now with the United States Office of Education) gathered from the back files of the Junior College Journal, the PWDI newsletter and other sources, a group of "how to do it" type articles which were felt to have some potential use to colleges in the program. A special low-cost edition of 1500 was published and sent to all junior college presidents in the country and to our college coordinators, a large number of consultants, and others associated with this program who we felt would use it. When the supply was nearly exhausted, arrangements were made to turn over the negatives to AAJC for a special edition which would sell at $1.50 each so that colleges outside of this program could obtain it in quantity, if necessary, to meet their needs as well. This was one useful by-product of the program.

Finally, this interim report on the first year of the program will receive a wide distribution among junior colleges.

The Newsletter - Key to Communication

Especially valuable in this program has been the newsletter "Developing Junior Colleges" which was published on the average of every ten days during the first year of the project. The newsletter was edited by Selden Menefee with Esperanza Cornejo Alzona and Brent Smith serving as associate editors.

The newsletter quickly became known as the chief communications device, and a source that colleges could go to for a list of coming events and news of outstanding accomplishments of member and associate colleges. It received much praise in the conferences and in the evaluation by college presidents or coordinators. To the question "How valuable have you found the 'Developing Junior Colleges' newsletter?" 61 of the 85 college representatives said "very valuable," 22 said "of considerable value" and only two said of "some value." We know from this estimate that the newsletter was one of the most appreciated parts of the program; in fact, this was a higher rating that the one give to the program as a whole. An index to the newsletter for ready reference appears in Appendix C of this interim report and covers issues of the newsletter for the program's first year.

Monograph Series

The program's monograph series, including the junior college handbook "Focus on Action," has also been widely appreciated (no ratings on these monographs were included in the evaluation questionnaires that were sent out at mid-year, since most of them were not completed until later in the year).

A listing of titles in the Program With Developing Institutions Monograph Series for the 1968-69 Program is as follows:

#1 Planning for Development (First National Conference Proceedings)
#2 The Private Junior College: Problems and Solutions (Selected proceedings of two special workshops on private junior colleges)
#3 Occupational Education in the Junior College (Selected proceedings from two workshops on occupational education)
#4 Community Relations and Services in the Junior Colleges (Selected proceedings from two workshops on community services)
#5 Focus on Action: A Handbook for Developing Junior Colleges
#6 Developing Institutions: The Junior College (an interim report covering the first year of the Program, 1968-69)

* * * * * *

XI.

OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAM BY COLLEGES

A questionnaire for the purpose of a final evaluation of the 1968-69 Program revealed that over 70% of the colleges involved had found the program to have been "very valuable." A breakdown of the ratings given shows that 60 out of the 85 colleges rated the program "very valuable;" 21 rated the program "of considerable value" and only four considered the program to have been of "some value." No lower ratings were given.

The colleges were then asked to evaluate various facets of the consulting process, the workshops, specialized consulting and the publications of the program. Much of this evaluative information was incorporated in the previous chapters of this report. Of primary interest, however, is the actual benefit derived from the project by the colleges involved. In answer to the question: "In which of the following areas has the college benefitted from the Program's consulting process?" the breakdown of responses is as follows:

Changes in student personnel policy or practice	58 (of 85)
More realistic perception of role and goals .	55
Improvement of planning process	54
Administrative reorganization, real or planned	51
Improved faculty orientation and/or development	47
Changes in curriculum, made or planned . . .	36
Improved community or public relations . . .	29

Other (specify): (Here were listed educational media, data processing, institutional research, fund-raising, feasibility study, deeper understanding of job of colleges, learning resources planning and facilities, improved perspective of consulting process, pride felt by college, more faculty-administration dialog, computer use in administration and institutional research, assistance in finance and publications, financial planning and budgeting, improved relationship with the main campus)

The following comments were sent in by college representatives (the president or coordinator) in answer to question #10 of the questionnaire, which read as follows: "Please state which aspect of the Program With Developing Institutions has been most valuable to you and cite in narrative form your most interesting and significant experience with the program."

Region One - North Atlantic States

Allegany Community College (Maryland): Being fairly new to the junior college field, I believe the extensive and intensive exposure I received while attending the Airlie House Conference was

most valuable to me. Organizing and implementing the summer conference at Friendship Airport Motel for the North Atlantic States Region was an outstanding experience for me. Contributions made by the junior college students, faculty, administration and consultants made it possible for me to broaden my philosophy and concept concerning the community and junior colleges.

Catonsville Community College (Maryland): As I see it, the main advantage of having consultants come to the college or attending a conference is that it gives college personnel an opportunity to discuss mutual problems with other community college people and the solutions which they recommend. Furthermore, we obtained information on the organization of other colleges, their problems and how they were solved or handled, types of curriculums and problems with them, orientation programs for new faculty, and community service programs.

Charles County Community College (Maryland): It has been extremely beneficial to have outside consultants review our operation and isolate problem areas to be worked on. By calling on a locally-based consultant, Dr. Pesci, to follow-up and work intimately with the problem and see it through a solution, the entire consulting activity takes on realistic goals. The local consultant has an opportunity to offer more time for visits, and, in this case, he is quite familiar with our institution.

Harford Junior College (Maryland): We have been particularly fortunate to have met some valuable individuals on the AAJC Staff and on our consulting team. Particularly helpful has been the opportunity to receive consultants in specialized areas, such as educational media and data processing, so that we might develop these areas intelligently and rationally.

Thanks to our association with the Program With Developing Institutions this institution will expand its resources with far better effect than had we not had the opportunity to participate.

Mercer County Community College (New Jersey): The Airlie House Conference was especially valuable because it filled in many gaps in our knowledge of the program and involved a representative sample (administration, faculty and students) of the college community.

The conference was so valuable that it might prove beneficial to model the first meeting of next year's program after it. The involvement of faculty and students is crucial to the success of the program within an institution, and this meeting engendered tremendous enthusiasm in the group that attended from ours. In addition, the conference also offered an opportunity for interaction with personnel from other institutions in a comparable stage of development and with similar problems.

The consulting team that visited our institution was composed of four excellent individuals. Their impact was significant as evidenced to by our incorporation of their recommendations into our 1969-70 plans.

We are looking forward to more effective use of our consultants in next year's program. Since they will be involved with programs and processes which they helped to originate, this should prove to be a more valuable experience than the previous visits.

Region Two - The Carolinas

Montreat-Anderson College (North Carolina): The most important aspect of the Program With Developing Institutions is that the weaker institutions had an opportunity to participate in conferences in which they received full attention. Most regional and national conferences focus attention on and are dominated by the stronger institutions. In the PWDI the needs of the weaker colleges got full attention, and it has contributed a measure of confidence and optimism to participating colleges.

Some features of the PWDI overlapped the activities Montreat-Anderson is carrying on as part of its cooperative program with Teachers College of Columbia University, and I believe the main value of PWDI to the college was the contacts that were made in the program--contacts with other developing colleges and contacts with leaders in the junior college field (mainly consultants who visited the college and those who served as workshop and conference leaders). One good concrete result of this is the consortium plans we have with Brevard, North Greenville, Spartanburg and Lees-McRae. In addition, we have in the consultants who visited the college some able people, familiar with the college, on whom we can call in the future.

Lenoir County Community College (North Carolina): Cross-fertilization with many similar institutions. We have solved many problems in this exchange of information. Many housekeeping problems have been solved; faculty development has been identified as our most pressing problem. The most interesting experience was a "brainstorming" session with our consulting team and faculty. The program dramatically focused college needs upon faculty initiative and responsibility.

Mitchell College (North Carolina): Mitchell College has been out of the mainstream of educational innovation and new concepts concerning junior colleges. The Program With Developing Institutions gave us the opportunity to meet and associate with leaders in the field, and to learn from them. All experiences we have had with the program have been invaluable, but the Airlie House Conference, and the initial visit of the team of consultants, were probably the most significant experiences we have had with the program.

The results were a feasibility study of Mitchell College which is under way, a proposal for funds under Title III in a cooperative bilateral arrangement with Duke University, a proposal under Title III for a second year as a member of the AAJC's Program With Developing Institutions, and a proposal under Title VI for facilities in the Business Education Department. Ideas received at the conferences were most valuable, as were those received from consultants.

Mount Olive Junior College (North Carolina): To me, personally, the visit of the consultants to our campus was the most valuable. Joe Sutton made a very significant contribution to our college during his two visits to the campus. The opportunity to discuss our mutual problems with persons from other colleges at the regional workshop was very helpful.

Peace College (North Carolina): As is frequently the case, I believe that I have found the personal contact and the ideas obtained through such contacts to be most valuable to me. I personally feel that we have received ideas and have been pointed in the right direction; now we must have the energy and the courage to carry the ball ourselves.

Our visit by Dr. Kuhns, dealing largely with administrative organization, was very helpful and one which may ultimately bear fruit. The problem of creative administrative leadership may very well be the greatest handicap of developing institutions--a problem which probably starts with the president's office and extends throughout the entire staff. Addressing ourselves to this major problem should result in progress.

North Greenville Junior College (South Carolina): The second visit of the consultants was most valuable as we got down to specifics. The first visit was largely exploratory. The regional workshop was helpful but only one of the presidents of the participating institutions attended. The private junior college workshop was very helpful as the conference resulted in a proposal for a consortium, which might have gotten off the ground at the regional workshop, if we had worked at it.

All three of our consultants were from public comprehensive community colleges. Their perspectives on the liberal arts, denominational and residential junior college were helpful and interesting.

Region Three - Georgia - Florida

Abraham-Baldwin Agricultural College (Georgia): The Calloway Gardens Workshop, August 29-30, 1968, was the most valuable aspect of the program so far as our college is concerned. There, eight key members of our faculty sat with 48 of the nation's best for two days of discussion about various aspects of instruction in the junior colleges. For the first time we saw a panoramic view of the job awaiting us in Georgia, compared with the performance in another state. This challenge awakened us with a jar. There, we saw the need for transition from junior college type operations to the community college type, with something for all high school graduates.

Services of the team of consultants to our campus ranked a close second to the above in terms of significance....They shook us to the ground, cited our shortcomings, and rendered a pointed written report, which we circulated to all members of the faculty and used as a planning document. Faculty morale bristled.

Middle Georgia College: The program has been helpful to our institution in the opportunity it has afforded us to become involved with other similar institutions in the discussions of problems and the interchange of possible solutions to the problems. This has been generated at some of the regional meetings, but more so by the consultants who visited our campus.

This contact with other junior colleges in our area has been many times the only contact we have had with them as a distinctive group since most of the professional meetings have included senior institutions as well as junior colleges. Therefore, due to this fact and also because the activities of the program have been geared specifically for junior colleges, we have found it most helpful and are hoping that it will be funded for the next year.

Norman College (Georgia): While all aspects of the program have been valuable to both Norman College and myself, I feel that the two most valuable ones were the Airlie House Conference and the consulting team visiting the college. I had an opportunity at the Airlie House Conference to get to know the personnel of AAJC and HEW. Also, while getting to know administrators of other junior colleges around the country, I was able to learn of problems and innovations on their campuses. The consultant team which visited our campus did a wonderful job of helping us to take a good look at ourselves and to initiate action toward improving community relations. I cannot praise the total program too highly. It has done things for Norman College that it could never have accomplished on its own.

Reinhardt College (Georgia): Many aspects of the program in the past year have been of value to Reinhardt College. The two visits by the consulting team were valuable in helping the college to better identify present and future goals and purposes. The various conferences were very informative, bringing to the fore many innovative ideas. The AAJC publications helped to keep many of us abreast of events and progress of the program.

Of greatest value to Reinhardt was the Private College Workshop at Montreat, North Carolina, in November of 1968. Because of the similarity of programs of those institutions in attendance, there seemed to be greater general understanding and a freer flow of communication. Those ideas discussed related directly to the Reinhardt program. This was not the case at other conferences consisting of both public and private colleges.

South Georgia College: The visits of the consultants to our campus (Piekarski, Wurz and Garner) were the most valuable part of the Program With Developing Institutions for South Georgia College. They gave us very valuable assistance and continue to act as resource persons when we need advice.

Central Florida Junior College: Central Florida Junior College has profited greatly from its involvement in the AAJC Program With Developing Institutions. We have felt fortunate to have been able to

have the services of a number of the consultants who arrived at this institution in November and made a comprehensive evaluation of all phases of the college program, pointed out some problems, and made some suggestions as to their deviation. I think that we can safely state that in the ten-year history of this institution, no team of visitors made as distinct and lasting a contribution as did Dr. Parnell, Dr. Wellman and Dean Steiner. The subsequent visit was also important in that it gave us an opportunity to discuss the problems identified with the consultants and to make adjustments and changes prior to the second visit.

The availability of consultants in special areas after the team visit to help us with persistent problems was most helpful.

The Airlie House Conference was most interesting and significant because it brought together junior college people from every section of the country. The workshops and addresses set the tone for the visits by visiting consultants. This meeting, more than any other, gave us a sense of direction and some insight into the program.

Of all the regional conferences held, the conference held in Gainesville, Florida, was probably the best received. The theme--Faculty and Student Responsibilites--was timely, but more important the format and the composition of the conference was both unique and stimulating. It was my impression that the majority of the people came away from the conference with a greater understanding of each other's problems. We need more conferences in which people from administration, faculty and students can come to grips with mutual problems.

Our only regret is that it is not possible for a larger number of the faculty and staff of our college to attend the AAJC Convention in Atlanta.

Lake City Junior College (Florida): 1. Initial visit of consultants 2. Regional conferences 3. Publications

Lake-Sumter Junior College (Florida): One rewarding aspect of the program was that of exchanging views with junior college educators of other states on current and possible future issues.

It is anticipated that the most valuable activity will be the AAJC Convention in March 1969.

North Florida Junior College: The emphasis on making colleges in underprivileged communities stronger is the unique feature of the program.

There is no substitute for good personnel. Frequently small isolated colleges are unable to find the kind of talent to give the necessary leadership. Through the use of consultants, this kind of leadership becomes available.

The fact that the AAJC had a part in the administration of the Developing Institutions Program assured that professionals in the needs of junior college education would give the necessary direction to the program.

Region Four - Alabama - Tennessee

Southern Union State Junior College (Alabama): The two aspects of the Program With Developing Institutions that I consider to have been the most valuable were the visits by consultants to each institution and also the regional meetings and workshops.

The initial visits by consultants provided specialized assistance in problem areas in the individual institutions. The recommendations that came as a result of the consultant's visits clearly delineated areas for immediate and future concern. The return visits by consultants afforded a certain degree of evaluation in terms of the implementation of recommendations previously made. They also assisted in the assigning of priorities of objectives for the improvement of the total program at Southern Union State Junior College.

The regional meetings and workshops allowed not only for the identification of mutual problems of junior colleges in the area, but also made possible a pooling of resources and exchanging of ideas in the possible solution of these problems. The workshop made possible the formation of a consortium arrangement of eligible private and public junior colleges in the State of Alabama to seek Title III funds for the coming year.

The national three-day conference at the Airlie House provided an overview of the total junior college movement in the United States.

Mobile State Junior College (Alabama): As a developing institution with all of its population sectors involved in an entirely new educational dimension, Mobile State has enormously benefitted from expert consultation in the area of curriculum, improvement of administration and student personnel services.

The experience of tremendous resulting significance for Mobile State Junior College has been that of faculty orientation, on the spirit and philosophy of its new position in the educational hierarchy in general, and on the changing role of junior college instruction, in particular.

Northwest Alabama State Junior College: We have had of course more than one interesting and valuable aspect with the Program With Developing Institutions. It was both interesting and valuable for the members of our staff to have the privilege of associations which we have had through the program. Some of the most valuable ideas probably came from informal groups, both with our consultants and with the informal gatherings at the meeting in Airlie House and at our regional conferences.

Probably, if we had to list one though as being more valuable than the others, it would be an idea from the consultants about our organizational setup here at this institution. When these consultants came to our campus, we had the rather traditional organizational setup where the student goes to the faculty member, the faculty member to the department head, the department head to the dean, the

dean to the president, etc. It was our feeling that this was not entirely satisfactory; that we wanted to retain this organizational pattern because it did allow us to operate with great speed and efficiency, but it was also our desire to have an organizational pattern where the views of any and every person at the institution could be heard. It is our feeling that better decisions can be made if we know the wishes and desires and the thoughts of those with whom the decisions will affect. Therefore, we challenged this group of consultants when they came on our campus to develop with us such an organizational chart, whereby we would not lose control if we at some time in the future had some radical group come on the campus, but where we could share as much decision-making as possible with the people whose lives these decisions would affect; they designed such an organizational chart.

Although we have not been operating a sufficient amount of time to know that this chart is exactly what we want, at this stage of our development we feel, though, that it has definitely helped us this school year and will probably help us to solve many of the problems in the future....This, we believe, is probably one of the aspects of this program that has been most valuable to us.

Cumberland College of Tennessee: 1. Re-evaluation of our purposes, objectives, and programs with consultants who were objective, experienced, talented and concerned. Cumberland was most fortunate in having Dr. Parnell, Dr. Davitt and Dr. Wiegman as members of our consulting team. We looked at our philosophy and objectives realistically with questions of Why? How? and What?

2. We looked at similar problems and shared possible approaches and solutions to them.

3. We now have a close personal tie with the AAJC through our association with Mr. Menefee, Mr. Orcutt and their associates. Dr. David Smith of the USOE has been on our campus, has attended regional conferences and has gained new insight into the challenges facing the private junior colleges and the potential that can be achieved through our combined efforts. We feel that we are now a part of the AAJC and a respected participant in its program.

Freed-Hardeman College (Tennessee): It seems that the most valuable from my viewpoint are the visits by the consultants and the conferences. The conference for the private colleges was especially helpful.

Hiwassee College (Tennessee): I have found all of the programs very good. Being a private college, I think the one program that was most profitable to us was the Cumberland Conference which dealt with fund raising. Also, we have had consultant help in this area which has been excellent. Fund raising is one of our biggest concerns and we have received a great deal of help from the AAJC Program. We are now planning a complete reorganization of our development program which will cover fund raising, alumni relations, and possibly admissions.

Martin College (Tennessee): The publication program was most valuable.

Morristown College (Tennessee): The most valuable aspects of the Program With Developing Institutions have been the valuable suggestions offered by the visiting consultants. Morristown College was most fortunate in having consultants who could grasp the entire situation and offer suggestions which were real and workable--rather than far beyond our realm of reality. The consultants have continued to assist by mailing appropriate material from their own colleges and by sharing any new or helpful information which has been published. With the suggestions of these consultants, Morristown has more clearly defined the role of the college and has been able to grasp the true areas of need and difficulty. With continued work and renewed vigor, Morristown College will continue to profit from the program.

Region Five - Mississippi - Arkansas

Mississippi Delta Junior College: The conferences and the visits by the consultant teams resulted in giving us direction for immediate and long-range planning in curriculum, administrative reorganization and student personnel policy. Consultants in these areas were utilized at all of the conferences as well as on their visits to the campus. It is difficult to point out in particular any aspect of the program that has been the most valuable as we did not treat the various phases of it as separate, but as a unified whole. Specific results are as follows:

1) A student personnel director was employed and the registrar's office and counselors were brought together to create a student personnel organization with definite student personnel policies. Plans were also made for further expansion of the student personnel program.

2) An administrative flow chart of organization was devised that resulted in improved communication with faculty and administration and a better understanding of the duties of each of the administrative team.

3) The idea of continuous curriculum planning and the faculty's part in this was introduced and interest was created to lay the groundwork for next year.

Copiah-Lincoln Junior College (Mississippi): The Program With Developing Institutions has been most helpful to us in the areas of organization of our administration and in the process of improvement and planning. We look forward to working with the program in the coming year and stand ready to assist in any way we possibly can with the program.

East Mississippi Junior College: Inter-campus visits and visiting speakers.

Holmes Junior College (Mississippi): I have found the consultants very helpful especially in the help given for administrative reorganization. The publications proved to be very helpful. We are hoping for some follow-up consultants and expect them to prove very beneficial.

Mary Holmes Junior College (Mississippi): The most important aspect of the AAJC Program has been an opportunity to meet with and become a part of junior college people that are "on the move." Exposure to ideas, accomplishments and personalities of professional junior college people has been invaluable and inspirational.

Contacts with federal officials of HEW and access to their reaction and "style" of operation has been most helpful in furthering relations with the agency. Finally, friendships formed with others in the field will have lasting effect on personnel and the institution.

Southwest Mississippi Junior College: The most valuable aspect and significant experience was the development of the programs at the different conferences; also the association with the representatives from other schools. The discussion with them concerning problems common to all was most helpful.

Southern Baptist College (Arkansas): The consultants, both the team and the special consultants, probably made the most significant contribution to this institution, though the national conference was extremely helpful. We shared the consultants with the entire faculty and the impact was very valuable.

Region Six - Kentucky

Lees Junior College (Kentucky): This program has served as a catalyst of quite unexpected significance in bringing into being a spirit of cooperation among junior colleges of both the public and private sectors. This was especially evident in Kentucky where, as a result of this program, a new consortium of junior colleges has actually begun to develop. This cooperative arrangement involves three church-related, one independent and two public community junior colleges in some special programs which may well have long lasting effect on the programs of these various colleges.

It was especially fascinating to see individual barriers drop and a genuine spirit of mutual assistance manifest itself. It was quite evident to all that, rather than diminishing, the problems besetting our individual institutions today will instead increase in the years immediately ahead. Concerted efforts will be needed, all agreed.

The regional Workshop, held in Lexington at Carnahan House, was the springboard for this kind of activity. Where it will all end, only time can reveal. But the Kentucky institutions, with a very solid application on file with the U. S. Office of Education under Title III, expect results of real significance.

The other particular aspect of this program which has meant much to us, at Lees College, has been its flexibility. The development workshop at Cumberland College of Tennessee--not even dreamed of at the outset--actually proved to be a real highlighting experience. Additional consultants are opening unimagined opportunities for the participating colleges. We think it has been a great thing.

Alice Lloyd College (Kentucky): Since Alice Lloyd College already defined goals and instituted planning in a three-year Title III experience, the chief values were in (1) institutional cooperation, and (2) administrative detail, such as student involvement in institutional governance and (3) cooperative education planning.

Also, the attention to private junior college needs in this year of the Ken MacKay study will make for great confidence and encouragement on the part of this vital segment of the higher education community.

Henderson Community College (Kentucky): It is difficult to differentiate the relative value of the various aspects of the Program With Developing Institutions. The experiences we have had have all been rewarding. While the results in concrete terms are yet to be determined, our overall appraisal at this time is quite positive.

The experience with the consulting team and the special area consultants was most gratifying. This included their suggestions and observations, as well as the impact of good ideas and the effort of the faculty and staff to support acceptable goals and objectives. We were extremely well pleased with the manner and professional approach evident in the conduct of the consultants. We rate them tops! We are hopeful that their reports will support our budget requests to upgrade our program.

The Airlie House Conference was an impressive experience, especially affording the opportunity to relate to recognized leaders in junior college education.

The regional workshop set the stage for a special program planned for consortium effort next year, if funded by Title III.

The opportunity to make the Junior College Journal available to all faculty and advisory board members has led to new interest and awareness going on in the field. The opportunity to extend an AAJC Convention experience to another staff member should broaden the interest in AAJC and professionalism in general.

Paducah Junior College (Kentucky): no response

Southeast Community College (Kentucky): The new and innovative ideas gained from association with education specialists have been most valuable. Emphasis has been placed on future growth and improvement of our colleges; we have tried to analyze our problems and have cited long-range objectives. The consultants offered assistance in drawing up plans for the future--setting long-range objectives as well as immediate objectives.

An interesting experience was the workshop at Morehead State University where the model for the Kentucky Consortium was planned. We were thus able to identify institutional goals which are achievable in the near future.

Southeastern Christian College (Kentucky): I would rate right at the top the attendance at the regional workshop at which we formed our

Kentucky Junior College Consortium. This was a tangible result of the program. The meeting of the private colleges at Lebanon, Tennessee, was in my estimation a better meeting, but with results perhaps less tangible at the present. One of the most valuable aspects of the program, as far as our institution is concerned, was the opportunity for the involvement of our board of trustees. What we have been doing up to this year has been more like blind groping, but I believe we have now gained a sense of direction which will enable us to begin to capitalize upon the help we have already received and shall receive in the future.

Region Seven - Michigan - Illinois - Indiana

Macomb County Community College (Michigan): I would value the consultants' visits as the most useful aspect of the program, and of those consultants engaged by the college, Dr. Joe B. Rushing offered the most insights and constructive comments for our use.

Second in value to Macomb were the regional conferences held at Macomb and in Chicago which resulted in an interchange of ideas and experiences and which have had an effect upon our local practices.

Third in importance, I would rate the literature provided by AAJC, particularly the "Developing Junior Colleges" newsletter.

Finally, the conferences at Washington in April and Airlie House in June were of benefit to us.

Lansing Community College (Michigan): The majority of the Lansing Community College faculty and staff subscribe and are committed to the improvement of instructional methodology and the use of new approaches, techniques and instructional media to accomplish their instructional task. The Program With Developing Institutions has given the college the opportunity to receive information, exchange ideas and consult with others who have similar commitments. It has also helped us to set goals and time limits for the completion of proposals and projects. Our community service program, pilot demonstration program in guidance and the development of audio-visual tutorial programs are definitely further along than they would have been without the aid and assistance of the funds and resources supplied by the program.

We were especially pleased with the quality of resource people available as consultants. Their counsel and suggestions have been helpful to faculty and staff through the entire institution.

Michigan Christian Junior College: The making of new friends among junior college educators has been a very rich and helpful experience. Our unstructured sessions at the various conferences have in many ways been as helpful as the more formally planned programs. The opportunity to share common problems and our quest for satisfactory answers has been rewarding.

Perhaps the conference for private junior and church-related two-year colleges in Montreat, North Carolina, was the high point of

the year for representatives of Michigan Christian Junior College. However, the visit of the initial team was a rather rigorous but beneficial experience for the administration and faculty. Follow-up consultations provided both encouragement and additional ideas for total institutional planning and development.

Suomi College (Michigan): Your contribution in terms of setting the record straight....was far more than I had ever expected. You saw with penetration into our problems and came up with viable solutions, which I am pursuing.

Belleville Junior College (Illinois): It was felt that the most interesting and significant experiences for our college were the conferences and workshops which were held for all the colleges within a given region. From this experience the college was able to gain both insight and information from other college programs.

Black Hawk College (Illinois): The most valuable aspects of the program have been the consultant visits which enabled us to do some significant brainstorming on vital issues for our institution. Also the newsletter which provides a perspective for our efforts and the opportunity of meeting with our colleagues in a conference setting.

We would suggest the development of a catalog of significant developments on a regional basis so that institutions can plan communications and visits with a view to hitching on to ideas which have a potentiality for local implementation.

Illinois Valley Community College: One of the most valuable and interesting experiences in the program was at the Airlie House Conference. Dr. Johnnie Ruth Clarke conducted the seminar on Remedial Curriculum Development with a flair that was inspirational, enlightening and highly enjoyable.

The regional conference in Chicago also produced some discussions which were informative and highly beneficial.

Joliet Junior College (Illinois): We have found the entire program to be of great value to us and surely hope we are included in the future. Since all we have had is the help of consultants, I cannot evaluate this against any of the other services, but we have certainly found this consulting service to be of great value.

Vincennes University (Indiana): Consultants' visits helped underscore to faculty and staff important areas needing correction and development. They made valuable suggestions about organization, and stimulated the faculty to action.

The sharing or ideas and information at Airlie House, with such a number of outstanding educators, provided a rich experience in dissemination of insight.

I don't know how important it was, but the most significant insight of the Student Rights Conference to me was the inability of some of the top student personnel workers to successfully involve students in discussion.

Region Eight - Iowa - Minnesota - North Dakota

Eastern Iowa Community College - Muscatine Campus: While we have benefitted a great deal from the entire program, the greatest value as far as maximum impact on this college is concerned would have to be through the assistance we received for our Student Service Center, for it could not be in operation without this help. This has enabled about 100 students who had poor academic backgrounds to improve to at least an average level of performance. Few of them could have been expected to do so without this special service.

Eastern Iowa Community College - Clinton Campus: The opportunity of talking with competent and knowledgeable consultants concerning our problems was the most valuable experience.

Ellsworth College (Iowa): 1. The Airlie House Conference was first rate. 2. Our team consultants were very helpful. A good many projects have developed because of suggestions that came from these men. One of the most significant developments is the student tutorial program and the change in our reading improvement offering.

Ottumwa Heights College (Iowa): The aspect which was most valuable to the college was done chiefly by Dr. Burkette Raper. Dr. Raper has taken steps which I believe will lead to the outstanding business and professional men of the local community setting up a foundation which will help the college in its financial difficulties.

I am assured that the consultants came to Ottumwa Heights College at a critical time. From their analyses, advice, and encouragement, our institution is now able to plot a program of development which will no doubt be as significant in the future of the college as was its decision to arise from its own ashes after its physical plant was destroyed by fire in 1957. I do not believe that I am presumptuous in saying that the work of the consultants since last July is like a beacon of light penetrating a fog of previous pessimism concerning the life of the institution.

Dr. Raper made an impact upon Ottumwa which has generated community interest that the college has never had before. From his work here we are moving toward a lay president who can serve in development. Our Board of Associates will most likely be enlarged with some Ottumwans from the Ottumwa Area Development Corporation. From this we will form an Ottumwa Heights College Foundation. Its purpose will be to provide permanent financial support from private sources to strengthen the educational program of the college in accord with its Christian tradition. This we would never have conceived without the help and inspiration of Dr. Raper. His return visit on December 4 when he addressed the 60 members of the Ottumwa Area Development Corporation was of great importance.

Dr. Alice Thurston and Dr. Frances Kelly also brought much to the college....Thank you for giving us the most stimulating year of our history.

Mesabi State Junior College (Minnesota): I believe the conferences we have had with Pat Distasio on the local level have been most valuable to us. He seemed to have many worthwhile practical answers to our problems.

I believe the August conference was most worthwhile to all of us as a group as we had an opportunity to exchange viewpoints on common problems.

Bismarck Junior College (North Dakota): There is no question but that every facet of the program has been of great value to Bismarck Junior College. The conferences proved to be a great clearing house for ideas from a wide area--especially the regional meeting, probably because it was closer to home in the problems discussed. However, I would have to say that our contacts with our consultants did the most for our institution. Having three men on campus for several days on the two visitations resulted in more constructive action than did any other factor. Although the Summer visitation occurred during the period when most of the faculty were absent, the observations were the basis of a new look at the three areas--administration, technical-vocational and student affairs. Having an outsider observe our institution brought forth ideas which we probably recognized but had not made progress in.

We were especially fortunate to initiate the team approach to administration as a result of consultant suggestion, especially after our conferences. A new approach to student-faculty-administrative communication is now in effect with good results. With our college getting into technical-vocational education on a greater scale, Dr. Grede did much to give guidance in this area. We say that Bismarck Junior College is "The College with a Future" and this association has done much to realize this goal.

Lake Region Junior College (North Dakota): The involvement of board members in the program has had the most stimulating effect of all phases of the program. This has been true in regard to the use of the consultants in meeting with the board; in board attendance at Airlie House; and in board members attending the conference in Minneapolis.

We have been going through a period of dynamic growth; but have pulled our future plans back to what I view as a more realistic level since meeting with our consultants. I hope that the faculty, too, will be more objective in looking at our long-range goals as a result of consultant visitations. I anticipate faculty and board attendance at the AAJC Convention will have considerable impact in formulating goals for the future.

Since the visits of our consultants, we have definitely taken steps to organize our administrative structure in a way which will be more efficient and less stressful to the chief administrator.

Region Nine - Kansas - Missouri - Colorado

Dodge City Community Junior College (Kansas): The consortium approach has been stimulating and the regional conference was excellent for the open exchange of ideas and practices. Perhaps initially, the most important part of the program was the consultant services. This has had a profound influence on our college and has been particularly beneficial to our Board of Trustees.

We hope to carry out a reorganization of our administrative structure to be effective in 1969-70, much of which we will trace to our AAJC/PWDI experiences. The Airlie House Conference was an extraordinary success. Without qualification, this has been the most significant junior college program we have ever been associated with.

Coffeyville Community Junior College (Kansas): All phases of the program have been valuable to our institution. No doubt the most valuable single phase was the first visit to the institution by the consulting team. The various consultants in specific areas were able to pinpoint areas needing attention in student personnel services, library, curriculum and administration organization; and to assist in setting priorities in meeting the goals and needed improvements.

Independence Community Junior College (Kansas): The direct contact with the consultants was the most valuable aspect of the program. The most significant experience was the heart-to-heart talks with Dr. Joe Rushing. With him, I felt I could confess my ignorance and be well-treated as an individual seeking help, rather than get the treatment received from some consultants who actually tried to belittle the individual and the institution. The feeling that these people are to help rather than to accredit or rate is very significant.

Mrs. Newman, our special resources center consultant, also gave us invaluable assistance.

Kansas City Kansas Community Junior College: The specialized consultants' services were of the most assistance to us. Their review of our plans tended to validate the projections we had made relative to building plans, curricular endeavors, etc. At the same time, it pointed out some weaknesses and allowed us to reassess our plans to make corrections.

Our most critical need for assistance was concerning planning for a multiple campus operation and we had a "split" community relative to this matter. Better support has now developed and we were able to proceed with our plans.

Mercy Junior College (Missouri): The Program With Developing Institutions has done a great deal to strengthen our faith in the place of the private junior colleges in the educational pattern of American higher education. It has helped us to establish goals, to determine priorities, and to see our system as a

service to society, and as a significant factor in the uplifting of the social standard.

The Program With Developing Institutions has, likewise, indicated roads to survival through a time of crisis and has given hope for growth and progress in spite of obstacles and setbacks.

Our most interesting experience was in seeing a revival of faculty morale and enthusiasm after a period of debilitating discouragement.

Rangely College (Colorado): The meetings have been valuable. I believe that the most interesting and significant experiences were those times that I visited with others, including the consultants on campus about problems and experiences that they have been through.

Otero Junior College (Colorado): The initial contact of the visiting team on campus was our best total experience. The team visited with a group of students, with the faculty, with the administrators group, and then individually. Learning more about supervision as conducted in a California junior college system proved to be quite valuable. Also, the work being done in the area of student personnel services, as described by Shirley Wurz, was most beneficial to us. Then, of course, the written report when distributed among the staff members, created considerable discussion and made it possible for us to do an excellent job of follow-up on the second visit. The area of faculty evaluation is one of the tough spots in higher education today. I think as a result of this program, our staff has become more alert to the necessity of an intelligent, professional approach to evaluation.

Region Ten - Oklahoma - Texas

St. Gregory's College (Oklahoma): The most valuable aspect of the AAJC/PWDI has been the provision of the opportunity to become more closely associated with neighboring junior colleges so as to actually effect future means of cooperation that will strengthen the institutions mutually as well as economize in terms of individual budgets. In our case, the AAJC Program led directly to the Oklahoma consortium, which would not have been founded without the impetus of the AAJC. This has been the most interesting and significant experience in the program, one that we did not foresee at the outset. In addition, administrative reorganization, changes in curriculum, and changes in student personnel, have evolved from the consultations with experts whose services were made available on campuses by AAJC. Thirdly, the opportunity to meet many administrators and consultants on the regional and national level has greatly aided in enlarging our own institutional perspective.

Connors State College (Oklahoma): The stimulating presence of consultants from other campuses has begun to bring our college into the mainstream of academic life. We have been encouraged and challenged by the findings of the consultants.

The regional conferences of developing institutions have been of great assistance to us in comparing notes as to procedures and in joint attack on our common problems.

The emphasis placed by AAJC on consortia arrangements has caused us to join forces with other institutions and so make an economical approach to solving problems.

It appears to me that some assistance to developing institutions to allow them to bring more people to the AAJC National Convention would be of great help.

Northern Oklahoma College: The program is probably most properly evaluated in terms of its total impact. Each part may not be recognized as contributing a great deal, but the net effect of all facets--publications, consultative visits, attendance at regional and other conferences, etc.--all add up to increased alertness and professionalism among administration and faculty. It has tended to focus our attention more than ever on planning and development in a formal way, utilizing all sources of help and assistance. The program has provided a perspective for this planning and change.

Laredo Junior College (Texas): 1. The teaching fellowships ranked first in our estimation. They enabled us to add to our curriculum and assisted us financially. 2. The consultants helped us to think through many of our problems and helped us to arrive at some decisions.

Lee College (Texas): The opportunity for professional contact both through the regional conferences and the consulting teams has had a most helpful and stimulating effect on both our administrative staff and faculty. The tempo of college activities has been given a catalytic effect in terms of our desire to improve internal campus communications and innovative institutional practices. Our special financial counsel, Vice-President James Hobson of UCLA, has been particularly helpful and has helped in stimulating a new research proposal which has been sent to the Esso Education Foundation.

We are looking forward to future developments in the Program With Developing Institutions for 1969-70.

Ranger Junior College (Texas): We received the most help from the consultants in regard to our student personnel program. We feel that the program was of great help to us as we were admitted to the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

Another significant experience was the Fall visit of the consultants. They met with the faculty as a group and individually, to provide orientation and philosophical approaches to the junior college field.

Southwest Texas Junior College: We feel that the program was of considerable value to us in the areas of faculty development and long-range planning. Most of our young instructors have received great benefit from a discussion of the goals and objectives of our college. Many experienced faculty members have indicated that our three-day workshop on faculty development was of great value to them. The Program With Developing Institutions has caused both faculty and

5. Attitude of consultants, knowledgeable and realistic, and their ability to relate to staff and trustees, changed the outlook of the staff, regarding the role of consultants in a developing institution.

Lassen College (California): The most valuable aspects of this program to me center around one-to-one contacts with colleagues from areas of whose experiences heretofore either I have been ignorant or I have had only glancing acquaintance on an occasional cold statistics sheet. Our efforts to develop a strong California consortium of small junior colleges certainly have been strengthened by our experiences working as a member of the "Washington - California Region Eleven."

Further, the continuing work between our college and the consulting team provided by this program have brought us up-to-date on the community college role in California and on the national scene. Our own efforts have hence been more effective in administrative organization, curriculum development and student personnel management.

Region Twelve - Puerto Rico

Puerto Rico Junior College: no response

Humacao Regional College (University of Puerto Rico): The opportunity to get together with the administrative personnel from the other two-year colleges in Puerto Rico was the most valuable experience.

Aguadilla Regional College (Inter-American University): 1. The Airlie House Conference and regional conferences--identification of factors that interfere with our growth. 2. The motivation to face our problems and discuss them frankly with the administration and in the Senate.

Arecibo Regional College (Inter-American University): The explanation of the true program and place of the junior college, and what it can contribute to the nation is the most valuable aspect of the program.

Barranquitas Regional College (Inter-American University): The visit of a four-man consulting team to our campus made us immensely proud--proud because we were being noticed. It meant that Washington cared about us and what we are doing in this isolated region. The effect of the team visit is still being reflected daily in the actions and attitudes of the faculty and staff of this small college.

Until one has visited Barranquitas, one cannot imagine how isolated we are from the mainstream of life in Puerto Rico. Our area, located in the mountains, is one of the most beautiful spots in the world, but the roads are poor and travel here is difficult.

We rarely see tourists here and only Spanish is spoken. At times we have felt like the "forgotten college." We, ourselves, know the purpose we are serving here but we have feared that others did not know, and perhaps did not care. Now, we know that AAJC cares very much and it has had an invigorating effect on us all.

Bayamon Regional College (Inter-American University): Being associated with AAJC has been very beneficial for the Puerto Rican group. Prior to our association with you, each of us worked independently and there was no sense of belonging to a unified group. AAJC has united us, not only professionally, but the friendship ties are very strong. We were adrift--now we know where we are going. The objectives and reasons for existence are very clear--we are doing our best, in spite of blocks in our way, to reach these aspirations.

Not only have we, directors, been awakened to the pressing needs of society on colleges, but the people above us, in whose hands lies the future of regional colleges are being identified with this movement and they too are seeing the need to continue upgrading junior colleges to meet these very important needs of our people.

I wish to thank AAJC for all the help we are receiving. We are receptive for ideas, and we are all trying very hard to put into practice ideas we receive from you.

Ponce Regional College (Inter-American University): These conferences have been an asset to me. They have opened many new avenues of service and have given me the necessary strength to fight at the level of the top administration on behalf of the Ponce College. For the first time we dare ask for more autonomy. Soon you will hear from us. We are asking the Board of Inter-American University to make a decision regarding our colleges. All these things are only possible because we have been nurtured at the AAJC conferences.

In addition, the colleges were asked in the questionnaire "Do you think the Program would have been equally valuable if AAJC had not participated in it?" 80 of 85 colleges felt that the AAJC participation had been vital; five did not know. No college replied in the affirmative to the question.

XII.

C O N C L U S I O N S

It can be safely stated that with two or three possible exceptions, the member colleges involved in the Program With Developing Institutions received some impetus in their planning and in their actual development as a result of the program. This is to be attributed partly to the fact that the program was a flexible one.

One evidence of the value of the program was contained in a questionnaire given out at the Fall workshops in 1968 as a basis for planning for a possible second year of the program: 93% of those colleges queried (member and associate) favored extension of the program into a second year; 96% were in favor of their college's participation in a possible second year of the program; 97% favored the proposal of the project staff and advisory committee that a second-year program focus on faculty orientation and in-service training. Finally, 98% favored a Title III consortium, with AAJC as the coordinating agency.

One example of the extent to which a little aid may create change on a campus is in the following actual report from Ottumwa Heights College, Ottumwa, Iowa, on "Implementation of the Recommendations of the Consultants from the Program With Developing Institutions:"

(1) Secured for the library numerous books on higher education (from bibliography submitted by Dr. Frances Kelly)
(2) Wrote to about 80 colleges and secured their
    Faculty Handbooks
    Administrative Charts
    Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws
    Faculty Contracts
    Constitution for Faculty Organization
    Faculty Salary Scales
    Student Handbooks
(3) Amended our bylaws in several respects
(4) Added faculty and students to Standing and Special Committees
(5) Created a faculty conference room
(6) Relocated administrative offices--of special note is the moving of the director of student affairs to the general administrative area
(7) Created a student lounge (informal)
(8) Created a counseling office (Roth Hall)
(9) Secured new studios for the Art Department, with an office for the instructor (Roth Hall)
(10) Sponsored a two-day faculty workshop (one day at Lake Wapello--with informal setting for committee meetings)
(11) Had a very successful orientation day

(12) Experimented with a new type of student-faculty reception
(13) Had an "articulation" meeting with Dr. Mel Everingham, Superintendent, Iowa Technical School of Area XV
(14) Experimented with some aspects of central purchasing
(15) Rented for one period a week the gymnasium of Walsh High School for physical education for men; also have a swimming class for men at the YMCA
(16) Through the Midwest Junior College Consortium with the University of Illinois - presented proposals for more help to faculty as counselors; student orientation
(17) Revision of Student Handbook by committee representing students and faculty
(18) Visit with the Director of Student Affairs, Iowa Technical School, and the planning of more mutual social affairs
(19) The establishment of office hours for the college nurse so that she may be available for greater consultation by students
(20) Greater use of the college chaplain for student counseling
(21) Plans for meetings between administration and faculties of the four Iowa private junior colleges:
Grand View College, Des Moines
Mt. St. Clare College, Clinton
Ottumwa Heights College, Ottumwa
Waldorf College, Forest City
(22) Securing of a head resident for Kennedy Hall which frees the director of student affairs from resident hall details and gives her more time for the execution of student personnel services

--Ottumwa Heights College
October 1, 1968

Innovations

One of the dividends of this program has been the formation of numerous consortia from the ranks of colleges originally funded. AAJC played some small part in the organization of ten consortium applications. Six of these were funded, four were not. In the case of Puerto Rico, we had advocated an island-based consortium with some association with AAJC's mainland services. This was funded completely independently, to the surprise of the central office, although an AAJC relationship may be built in subsequently.

One of the consortia formed, more or less under program auspices, was that of six Kentucky junior colleges, both public and private. They were funded to the extent of $250,000 for a multi-faceted program that was developed directly out of the Kentucky regional conference held in Lexington in September of 1968. Other consortia were formed in South Texas, California, Washington State, Oklahoma and Puerto Rico; others were not formed, although applied for, in Northern Michigan, Alabama and North Carolina. The Program With Developing Institutions has been useful in promoting the voluntary association of colleges in cooperation with each other not only

for the purpose of obtaining funds under Title III of the Higher Education Act, but also for other purposes, many of which are voluntarily funded. In addition, although consortium colleges, as in Kentucky, are taken out of the year's program with AAJC, they become voluntary associates of the program. For example, the Oklahoma consortium has a definite budget for enabling representatives of the three colleges in last year's program to attend this year's PWDI meetings. Although not centrally funded, they have their own budget for this in another Title III program.

Another form that this association took was an application, encouraged by the AAJC, by some 16 Georgia colleges for a statewide consortium of all junior colleges under Title III for both planning and faculty development. Since funds were short and the program for planning under AAJC was not funded, the U.S. Office of Education arranged for the application to be submitted not independently, but as an AAJC consortium and then narrowed it down to a smaller number of colleges. This group is operating as a very independent-minded but integral part of the program for the coming year.

The outstanding example of the value of the program in bringing junior colleges together is Puerto Rico. When the program director first went to Puerto Rico in April 1968 to meet representatives of all the two-year institutions and plan for the year's program there (Puerto Rico was one of the 12 regions of the first-year program), he found that this was the first time in the history of the island that representatives of all the two-year or junior colleges had met together in the same room. In fact, it was not definitely known how many such institutions there were on the island. It turned out that there were 16 and they were very interested in cooperating once they were able to get together under the auspices of this program.

As a result, a total of five workshops were held during the year in Puerto Rico in which outstanding consultants went down and an association was formed which has become a permanent group in the form of an advisory committee to the Puerto Rico Junior College Consortium. So out of this may come integrated planning for the island and a rich program of cultural and personnel exchange with colleges on the mainland. The independent consortium of Puerto Rico's two-year colleges was funded to the extent of $100,000 for the 1969-70 year and contains provisions for a part-time coordinator to be charged to the program, money for promoting planning of occupational programs on the island and many constructive features. This would never have come about without the integrating and catalyst influence of the Program With Developing Institutions.

These consortia, and some other bi-lateral grants to members of the program, account for the shrinkage of the number funded for the second year in the faculty development program from 85 to 40 of the

original colleges. In the second year of the program 13 new colleges have been added making a total of 53 member colleges. As this interim report is being prepared, there are a total of 254 associate colleges in the program (including all those funded in the previous year's program who are not now member colleges) and 50 additional colleges involved slightly by virtue of supplying one or more consultants to the program. The total number of junior colleges touched in some degree by the Program With Developing Institutions is 357, which represents more than a third of the nation's junior colleges. The colleges involved in the program are in 42 states, Canada and Puerto Rico.

Another innovation which was encouraged where funds permitted was inter-campus visits. Several colleges requested that they be permitted to use consulting funds to send one or two faculty members to visit the home campus of some of the consultants or campuses where advanced programs were being conducted. Thus the president of Texarkana College returned the visit of his administrative consultant, President Robert Novak of Orange County Community College in New York and spent some time looking at the programs in operation there. Similarly, Wharton County Junior College in Texas used some consulting funds to enable the president and one other staff member to go to California to visit several outstanding colleges and observe the programs there. The project staff felt that future programs of this nature should have a certain amount of funding built in to provide for such inter-campus visits, which can be very useful, especially in the faculty development program.

Another unforeseen dividend of the consulting program has been the formation of long-range friendships and ties between colleges and consultants. Thus, consultant John Davitt of Glendale College in California, who visited several Eastern colleges in the team-consulting program, continued his relationship by sending sample forms to the colleges when he returned to his home base, and later he visited one of these colleges, Cumberland College of Tennessee, entirely at his own expense when he happened to be in the Eastern part of the country. Such relationships are common as a result of the program.

Economical Use of the Dollar

One of the outstanding values of the first year's Program With Developing Institutions has been the demonstration that the tax dollar can be stretched to help a large number of institutions at a modest costfor each one, provided the proper coordination and an imaginative, flexible program can be provided.

In the present program, at a cost of less than $7000 per college, outstanding results were obtained in most of the colleges involved, whereas in other programs very large expenditures per college are made and there is often no evaluative evidence that these grants are effective in proportion to the number of dollars spent. It is the

opinion of the program's staff that large grants are necessary to move colleges ahead under certain circumstances, but we believe, that it has become clear, as a result of the first year's work, that if 10% to 20% of the funds of a program like Title III could be made available for an extensive rather than an intensive program, some benefit can be spread to a very large number of colleges and excellent results can be obtained.

Of the $585,008 allocated to this program in 1968-69, some $473,000 was allocated by the 12 regional coordinators to the AAJC to develop the coordinating program. The expenditure of these funds is given in detail in Appendix D. Actually, at the end of the first year's operation, on March 31, $77,576 had not been expended or allocated, and these remaining funds were allocated to continue the program to the end of the fiscal year so that the 1969-70 Program could extend for that full fiscal year. Thus, the economical expenditure of the first year's funds actually extended the program itself three additional months for a total of fifteen months.

The program received widespread publicity throughout the country and reflected considerable credit, not only upon the American Association of Junior Colleges but on the U.S. Office of Education which supplied the funds. 165 junior colleges in 36 states and Puerto rico applied for participation in the 1969-70 AAJC Program.

Dr. Paul Carnell told a workshop meeting at the AAJC Convention in Atlanta in March 1969 that the U.S. Office of Education was very pleased with the operation of the first year's program, which had shown results within a few months by improving the caliber of applications for Title III aid for the coming year. This became apparent when the applications were received by November 15th and were later read and evaluated by a panel of consultants. This was, according to Dr. Carnell, the real test of the effect of the program and the results in this department have been demonstrated.

Another benefit is the emergence of a large panel of highly qualified consultants, most of whom have been tested in the field. This list has been used not only by member colleges but by associate colleges as well, and by other departments of AAJC. A classified directory of some 400 such consultants has resulted in the second year of the program.

A shortcoming of the first year's crash program was that its design necessarily involved a high degree of central control. Fortunately this was offset by a built-in potential for flexibility, which saved the program from being too rigid. But one obvious

need was to encourage more leadership and initiative on the local college level. This type of decentralization was built into the second-year program on faculty development. The college representatives are showing great initiative in planning conferences and local programs.

The next great need is to broaden the program by letting new colleges in for a new "planning for development" phase, based on the first year's program but with improvements growing out of two years' experience. The extent to which this may be possible may depend on the level of Federal funding of higher education for 1970-71.

It is the hope of AAJC that the experience gained in this program may be useful in other Federal programs as well, where the "extensive" approach is needed to stretch available funds to serve a larger number of colleges.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

"Questions and Answers"

A Basic Document Describing the 1968-69 Program

Questions and Answers About The

AAJC Program With Developing Institutions

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
OF JUNIOR COLLEGES
1315 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

Project Address:
1225 Connecticut Avenue N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20036
Phone: Area Code 202-462-4811

---

1. What is a "Developing Institution?"

In the broadest sense, every junior college is a developing institution. So is Harvard. When an institution stops developing, it is dead.

As used in this program, the term "Developing Institutions" is defined in Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965—namely, institutions five years old, striving to improve, accredited or in process of accreditation, and "isolated from the main currents of academic life."

2. Who selected the colleges in this Program?

The U.S. Office of Education's Division of College Support.

3. On what basis were the colleges selected?

All were applicants for assistance under Title III (Developing Institutions), Higher Education Act. The U.S. Office of Education felt that all in the group selected would benefit by participation in a program such as this one, in terms of ability to plan for their own improvement.

4. Who pays for the program?

It is entirely paid for through a federal grant to 12 colleges designated as "regional coordinators," who in turn contract with the American Association of Junior Colleges for its services. AAJC administers the program and is accountable to the U.S. Office of Education. Total amount of the grant allocated for the participating colleges in this program is $585,008. The money is part of the 22 per cent ($6.6 million) set aside for junior colleges under Title III of the Higher Education Act in 1968-69.

5. How many junior colleges are participating in the Program?

In the program funded by the U.S. Office of Education, 85 colleges are full participants. Of these, 78 are in the continental United States, 7 in a special program in Puerto Rico.

6. What kinds of colleges are they?

Of the 78 on the continent, 54 are public community colleges, 24 are private junior colleges. Nearly all are small colleges in small cities and towns; more than two-thirds are in the South or in border states.

7. Can any college get in?

Many junior colleges not on the list of 85 have asked to be included in the program. No funds can be expended for colleges outside the program; but a list of a score or more of "associates" has been formed by AAJC—colleges who are invited to attend regional conferences (at their own expense) and receive the newsletter and other publications of the Program With Developing Institutions. All are near participating colleges, and all have been recommended for inclusion by the regional coordinating colleges. Some colleges on this "associate" list will receive calls from consultants investigating the possibility of cooperative arrangements among the colleges.

8. What s the purpose of the Program?

The underlying purpose is the same as that of Title III of the Higher Education Act, as expressed in this excerpt from Section 301(a) of the Act:

> The purpose of this title is to assist in raising the academic quality of colleges which have the desire and potential to make a substantial contribution to the higher education resources of our Nation but which for financial and other reasons are struggling for survival and are isolated from the main currents of academic life, and to encourage and assist in the establishment of cooperative arrangements under which these colleges may draw on the talent and experience of our finest colleges and universities, and on the educational resources of business and industry, in their effort to improve their academic quality.

Developing colleges have a special problem in that, by their very nature, they are likely to be inadequately staffed to plan for their own improvement. Many lack the resources and expertise to develop a program which would enable them to escape from underdevelopment. Hence the interest of the American Association of Junior Colleges in working with this particular group of two-year colleges. The Program With Developing Institutions will help developing colleges work out plans for improvement not only of administration and curriculum, but of recruitment and training of needed staff, of student personnel services, and community relations.

9. What are the specific objectives of the Program?

To use all resources available to assist developing two-year colleges in:

(1) Analyzing their own problems and shortcomings in meeting the needs of their students and communities;

(2) Setting long-range objectives to be attained over a period of years, and immediate objectives attainable in a shorter time;

(3) Assigning priorities to these objectives for the immediate future and for ultimate improvement;

(4) Exploration of meaningful means of inter-institutional cooperation (particularly in areas where junior colleges are geographically isolated); and

(5) Finding the means to support a year-to-year program of improvement within this framework by exploring all possible avenues of financial support, public and private.

10. What is AAJC's responsibility in the Program?

The Program With Developing Institutions is a cooperative effort of the U.S. Office of Education, the American Association of Junior Colleges, and 12 regional centers at the junior college level. The 12 regional coordinator colleges, with the funds at their disposal, pay for all travel and other expenses of representatives of the 85 colleges at conferences. Program coordination is the responsibility of AAJC. This includes administration, preparation for conferences, assignment of consultants to colleges in the Program.

11. How long will the program last?

The project is funded for one year, starting April 1, 1968, and ending March 31, 1969. Much of the activity will be concentrated in a crash program from June to November, 1968, with the focus on planning for institutional improvement.

12. Who is running the program for AAJC?

The program director is Selden Menefee, writer and educator, formerly of the University of Washington, Sacramento State College, Los Rios Junior College District (Sacramento, California); consultant to UNESCO and the Academy of General Education in India, and consultant to AAJC in 1965 and 1968. Assistant director is Shafeek Nader of Toronto and Boston Universities, one of the founders of Northwestern Connecticut Community College at Winsted, Connecticut, an active participant in the creation of the Connecticut Regional Community College system, and a businessman with an abiding interest in college-community relations. Staff assistant is Mrs. Esperanza Alzona, a Philippine educator now living in Washington. Secretary is Lee Ann Peterson, a graduate of the University of Montana. This AAJC staff works in close collaboration with Dr. David Smith of the U.S. Office of Education in planning the Program.

13. Have junior college leaders helped to plan the Program?

Yes, all top staff members of the American Association of Junior Colleges—Executive Director Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., Associate Executive Director William G. Shannon, and staff specialists were in on planning the program and are participating in the conferences and serving as staff consultants. In addition, the Program has its own advisory board of seven persons, including representatives of all regions, both "developing" and well-developed junior colleges, private and public colleges, and universities concerned with junior college problems. The advisory board members, who also double as consultants when needed, are:

Dr. Isaac Beckes, President, Vincennes University, Vincennes, Indiana

Dr. Johnnie Ruth Clark, Dean of Academic Affairs, St. Petersburg Junior College, St. Petersburg, Florida

Dr. Frederic T. Giles, Dean, College of Education, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.

Mr. H. Dean Holt, Director of Planning and Development, Dallas County Junior College District, Dallas, Texas

Dr. W. Burkett Raper, President, Mt. Olive Junior College, Mt. Olive, North Carolina

Dr. James L. Wattenbarger, Director, Institute of Higher Education, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida

Dr. Robert Zimmer, President, Kankakee College, Kankakee, Illinois

14. What is the first major event of the Program?

A national three-day conference on planning for developing junior colleges was scheduled for June 13-16 at Airlie House, a conference center near Washington, on an expense-paid basis. Two persons—usually the president or a ranking administrator and one representative of the board of trustees—were to be sent from each of the participating colleges. The agenda included discussion by officials of the U.S. Office of Education and AAJC on the essentials of planning for development, and many workshop sessions were scheduled. Consultants whom AAJC brought into the program to assist individual colleges were also invited to attend. The sessions covered all important aspects of planning. Travel and living expenses at the conference were paid from Program funds.

15. How many consultants are in the Program?

The AAJC Washington office has amassed a panel of more than 100 consultants, all top people in the junior colleges and a few university people with long experience in the junior college field. These consultants will participate in a summer and fall program of consulting. They are about evenly divided among the

fields of Administration and Finance, Faculty and Curriculum, and Student Personnel Services, and many have special expertise in other fields as well. The Washington office of the AAJC Program seeks to send to each college a team of consultants who will implement the general aims of the program, while also trying to meet the special needs of the college for consultation of a more specialized nature.

16. How will the consultants operate?

Immediately after the national conference, the consultants will begin to visit the developing colleges and offer assistance in drawing up plans for the future. Teams of three consultants each will be in the field during late June, July, and early August. The teams will be assigned to visit all junior colleges involved in the Program, and also to take a look at other junior colleges in the same localities whose functions are related to those of the colleges in the Program. The consultants will usually spend three days at each place, assisting the college staffs on planning methods, objectives, and priorities, and also on particular local problems insofar as possible. They will pay special attention to inter-college relationships as well as to possibilities for financial aid. (In each team of three consultants, it is expected that one will be a specialist in curriculum and staff planning, one on student personnel and the other on administration and financing.) A special team of four or more consultants who are familiar with Puerto Rico and its problems, as well as with junior college problems in general, is scheduled to visit developing two-year colleges in Puerto Rico. At the conclusion of each initial campus visit, a report will be filed with AAJC by all consulting teams, covering contacts made and major problems studied.

17. Will the colleges meet on a regional basis?

Preliminary regional meetings were held in April and May to explain the Program and seek suggestions from the participating colleges. In late August or early September two-day regional conferences are planned in each of the 12 regions, or clusters of colleges, to deal with specific planning problems. At these conferences the consultants will report to college representatives the results of their visits and give further counsel on college plans. Top administrators and one or more board members from each developing junior college in the region will be invited to attend, with travel and living expenses paid for four representatives from each participant college and for five or more consultants for each regional conference. Sessions may be planned in such areas as finance, student personnel policy, and manpower utilization, including the availability of national teaching fellowships. Representatives of "associate" colleges may attend if they pay their own expenses.

18. Will the consultants revisit the colleges?

Following the regional conferences, in September and October the consultant teams, or members thereof who are available, will revisit the campuses they visited earlier to check on progress made, to offer further assistance in the application of planning principles on each campus, and to counsel administrators on how to activate improvement programs. This final step in the 1968 field program will be completed at least by early November, after which central office staff will continue to evaluate the field program, conduct research, issue newsletters and write a final report. The staff will also advise and consult with developing colleges which need further assistance, employing individual consultants within the budgetary limits of the Program, for the rest of the one-year period.

19. What reports will be made on the colleges?

All consultant reports are to be made to AAJC. Reports on the progress at each college in planning for improvement will be written by each consultant employed, by the end of November, 1968. These final reports will be filed with the AAJC Program With Developing Institutions and summary statements will be sent by AAJC to the Division of College Support, U.S. Office of Education. The program director will combine the data in these local reports, evaluate them, and make recommendations for the future to the AAJC Board of Directors and to USOE, in a final report on the program in 1969.

20. Will the colleges attend AAJC meetings?

One representative of each of the 85 developing institutions will be invited to attend the 1969 Annual Convention of the American Association of Junior Colleges, to be held in Atlanta March 3-7, 1969, on an expenses paid basis. One major session of the Atlanta conference will be devoted to the problems of developing colleges, followed by concurrent workshop sessions in which the college representatives will share experiences with colleagues from the same region and confer with consultants and with central staff members. Travel expenses, conference fees, and $16 per diem for the college representatives and selected consultants will cover their expenses for five days, and will be paid by the Program With Developing Institutions. It is hoped that the person whose attendance is paid would be in addition to the president or others who would normally attend. It is felt that this will be of real help in drawing the developing colleges into the mainstream of junior college affairs.

21. What about publications for the developing colleges?

Kits of publications by AAJC have been sent to all participating colleges. All full-time faculty members, administrators, and trustees will receive the *Junior College Journal* for the year 1968-69 (totaling about 5500 copies monthly). A newsletter, *Developing Junior Colleges*, is published by the Program itself, and special handbooks for the consultants and colleges are planned, as well as a definitive year-end report.

22. Which colleges come under the Program?

Following is the regional breakdown:

I. MARYLAND—NEW JERSEY (5)
Maryland:
*Allegany Community College, 340 Frederick, Cumberland, Maryland 21501
Catonsville Community College, Baltimore, Maryland 21215
Charles County Community College, LaPlata, Maryland 20646
Harford Junior College, Bel Air, Maryland 21014
New Jersey:
Mercer County Community College, Trenton, New Jersey 08606

II. THE CAROLINAS (6)
North Carolina:
*Montreat Anderson College, Montreat, North Carolina 28757
Lenoir County Community College, Kinston, North Carolina 28501
Mitchell College, Statesville, North Carolina 28677
Mount Olive Junior College, Mount Olive, North Carolina 28365
Peace College of Raleigh, Raleigh, North Carolina 27602
South Carolina:
North Greenville Junior College, Tigerville, South Carolina 29689

III. GEORGIA—FLORIDA (9)
Georgia:
*Abraham-Baldwin Agricultural College, Tifton, Georgia 31794
Middle Georgia College, Cochran, Georgia 31014
Norman College, Norman Park, Georgia 31771
Reinhardt College, Waleska, Georgia 30183
South Georgia College, Douglas, Georgia 31501
Florida:
Central Florida Junior College, Ocala, Florida 32622
Lake City Junior College, Lake City, Florida 32055
Lake Sumter Junior College, Leesburg, Florida 32748
North Florida Junior College, Madison, Florida 32340

IV. ALABAMA—TENNESSEE (8)
Alabama:
*Southern Union State Junior College, Wadley, Alabama 36276
Mobile State Junior College, Mobile, Alabama 36601
Northwest Alabama State Junior College, Phil Campbell, Alabama 35581
Tennessee:
Cumberland College of Tennessee, Lebanon, Tennessee 37087
Freed-Hardeman College, Henderson, Tennessee 38340
Hiwassee College, Madisonville, Tennessee 37354
Martin College, Pulaski, Tennessee 38478
Morristown College, Morristown, Tennessee 37814

V. MISSISSIPPI—ARKANSAS (7)
Mississippi:
*Mississippi Delta Junior College, Moorhead, Mississippi 38761
Copiah Lincoln Junior College, Wesson, Mississippi, 39191
East Mississippi Junior College, Scooba, Mississippi 39358
Holmes Junior College, Goodman, Mississippi 39079
Mary Holmes College, West Point, Mississippi 39773
Southwest Mississippi Junior College, Summit, Mississippi 39666
Arkansas:
Southern Baptist College, Walnut Ridge, Arkansas 72476

VI. KENTUCKY—INDIANA (7)
Kentucky:
*Lees Junior College, Jackson, Kentucky 41339
Alice Lloyd College, Pippa Passes, Kentucky 41844
Henderson Community College (University of Kentucky), Henderson, Kentucky 42420
Paducah Junior College, Paducah, Kentucky 42001
Southeast Community College (University of Kentucky), Cumberland, Kentucky 40823
Southeastern Christian College, Winchester, Kentucky 40391
Indiana:
Vincennes University, Vincennes, Indiana 47591

VII. MICHIGAN—ILLINOIS (8)
Michigan:
*Macomb County Community College, Warren, Michigan 48093
Lansing Community College, Lansing, Michigan 48914
Michigan Christian Junior College, Rochester, Michigan 48063
Suomi College, Hancock, Michigan 49930
Illinois:
Belleville Junior College, Belleville, Illinois 62221
Black Hawk College, Moline, Illinois 61265
Illinois Valley Community College, LaSalle, Illinois 61301
Joliet Junior College, Joliet, Illinois 60432

VIII. IOWA—MINNESOTA—NORTH DAKOTA (7)
Iowa:
*Eastern Iowa Community College, Muscatine Campus, Bettendorf, Iowa 52761
Eastern Iowa Community College, Clinton Campus, Clinton, Iowa 52732
Ellsworth College, Iowa Falls, Iowa 50126
Ottumwa Heights College, Ottumwa, Iowa 52501
Minnesota:
Mesabi State Junior College, Virginia, Minnesota 55792
North Dakota:
Bismarck Junior College, Bismarck, North Dakota 58501
Lake Region Junior College, Devils Lake, North Dakota 58301

IX. KANSAS—MISSOURI—COLORADO (7)
Kansas:
*Dodge City Community College, Dodge City, Kansas 67801
Coffeyville Community Junior College, Coffeyville, Kansas 67337
Independence Community Junior College, Independence, Kansas 67301
Kansas City Kansas Community Junior College, Kansas City, Kansas 66101
Missouri:
Mercy Junior College, St. Louis, Missouri 63131
Colorado:
Mesa Junior College, Grand Junction, Colorado 81501 *
Otero Junior College, La Junta, Colorado 81050

X. OKLAHOMA—TEXAS (9)
Oklahoma:
*St. Gregory's College, Shawnee, Oklahoma 74801
Connors State College, Warner, Oklahoma 74469
Northern Oklahoma College, Tonkawa, Oklahoma 74653
Texas:
Laredo Municipal Junior College, Laredo, Texas 78040
Lee College, Baytown, Texas
Ranger Junior College, Ranger, Texas 76470
Southwest Texas Junior College, Uvalde, Texas 78801
Texarkana College, Texarkana, Texas 75501
Wharton County Junior College, Wharton, Texas 77488

XI. WASHINGTON—CALIFORNIA (5)
Washington:
*Yakima Valley College, Yakima, Washington 98901
Columbia Basin College, Pasco, Washington 99301
Peninsula College, Port Angeles, Washington 98362
Walla Walla Community College, Walla Walla, Washington 99362
California:
Lassen Junior College, Susanville, California 96130

XII. PUERTO RICO (7)
Puerto Rico:
*Puerto Rico Junior College, Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico (San Juan) 00928
Humacao Regional College, University of Puerto Rico, Humacao, Puerto Rico 00661
Aguadilla Regional College, Inter American University of Puerto Rico, Aguadilla, Puerto Rico 00603
Arecibo Regional College, Inter American University of Puerto Rico, Arecibo, Puerto Rico 00612
Barranquitas Regional College, Inter American University of Puerto Rico, Barranquitas, Puerto Rico 00618
Bayamon Regional College, Inter American University of Puerto Rico, Bayamon, Puerto Rico 00619
Ponce Regional College, Inter American University of Puerto Rico, Ponce, Puerto Rico 00731

*=Regional Coordinating Center college.

May 20, 1968

*Rangely College (Rangely, Colorado 81648) of the Mesa Junior College District was the beneficiary of this grant.

A P P E N D I X B

A Listing of Team and Special Consultants

to Member Colleges of the Program

(Consultant team followed by listing of specialized consulting--unless otherwise indicated, consultant team members subsequently revisited the college in the Fall of 1968)

Region One - North Atlantic States

ALLEGANY COMMUNITY COLLEGE — Cumberland, Maryland

Donald Deyo, Dean JC, Franklin, Mass. - administration, curriculum
Ralph Granneberg, City College of San Francisco - faculty standards
Jerry W. Bray, Rockingham CC, Wentworth, N.C. - student personnel serv.

Roger L. Gordon, Temple Univ., Philadelphia - educational media

CATONSVILLE COMMUNITY COLLEGE — Catonsville, Maryland

Jack Hudnall, Bristol CC, Fall River, Mass. - administration & finance
Alice Thurston, University of Illinois - student personnel services
Virginia Keehan, Chicago City College - curriculum planning

Michael Brick, Teachers College, Columbia U. - master planning
Keith W. Larson, Eastern Iowa CC, Muscatine, Iowa - remedial educ.

CHARLES COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE — LaPlata, Maryland

Vaughn Whited, Oakland CC, Michigan - administration
Robert Wiegman, Florida Atlantic University - curriculum
Jean Page, Prince George's CC, Maryland - student personnel services

Frank B. Pesci, Catholic University - administration & business affairs

HARFORD JUNIOR COLLEGE — Bel Air, Maryland

Donald Deyo, Dean JC, Massachusetts - administration
Virginia Keehan, Chicago City College - curriculum planning
Alice Thurston, University of Illinois - student personnel services

John E. Austin, Pine Manor JC, Massachusetts - computers, data process.
Louise Giles, Oakland CC, Michigan - library media
Ervin Harlacher, Brookdale CC, New Jersey - curriculum, community serv.

MERCER COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE — Trenton, New Jersey

Harold E. Shively, North Shore CC, Massachusetts - administration
Patrick Distasio, Miami-Dade JC, Florida - remedial work
John Davitt, Glendale College, California - student personnel services
Dorothy Knoell, AAJC, Washington, D.C. - institutional research

Ruthe Erickson, JC District of St. Louis - library learning centers

Region Two - The Carolinas

MONTREAT ANDERSON COLLEGE — Montreat, North Carolina

Thomas J. Diener, University of Georgia - administration, consortia
Joseph T. Sutton, University of Alabama - faculty, facilities, inst. res.
Stuart Steiner, Genesee CC, New York - student personnel services

LENOIR COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE — Kinston, North Carolina

Harold E. Shively, North Shore CC, Massachusetts - administration
Robert Wiegman, Florida Atlantic University - faculty development
M. Frances Kelly, State Univ. of New York - inst. res. & stud. pers.

MITCHELL COLLEGE — Statesville, No. Carolina

Dale P. Parnell, Oregon Dept. of Public Instruction - administration
Raymond P. Perkins, University of Florida - curriculum
Jean Page, Prince George's CC, Maryland - student personnel services

William McFarlane, George Mason College, Virginia - feasibility study

MOUNT OLIVE COLLEGE — Mount Olive, No. Carolina

Moses Koch, Essex CC, Maryland - administration
Joseph T. Sutton, University of Alabama - institutional research
William Robbins, Mohawk Valley CC, New York - student personnel services

Tedd Kelly, Consultants for Educ. Resources, Wash., D.C. - fund-raising

PEACE COLLEGE — Raleigh, North Carolina

Isaac K. Beckes, Vincennes Univ., Indiana - administration & finance
A. W. Baisler, Jamestown CC, New York - administration & curriculum
Marie Prahl, Michigan State University - student personnel services

Eileen Kuhns, Mt. Vernon Jr. College, Washington, D.C. - instruction

NORTH GREENVILLE JUNIOR COLLEGE — Tigerville. South Carolina

Herbert Sussman, CC of Alleghany County, Pennsylvania - administration
Horace J. Burnette, Edison JC, Florida - curriculum and instruction
William Robbins, State University of New York - student personnel services

members of the administration made inter-campus visits

Region Three - Georgia - Florida

ABRAHAM BALDWIN AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE — Tifton, Georgia

Lee G. Henderson, State Dept. of Educ., Florida - community education
George Mehallis, Miami-Dade JC, Florida - learning centers
Robert O. Stripling, University of Florida - student personnel services

W. H. Nikkel, Oakland Community College, Michigan - business operation

MIDDLE GEORGIA COLLEGE — Cochran, Georgia

Wilson F. Wetzlar, Manatee JC, Florida - administration and finance
Clyde Nail, San Antonio College, Texas - curriculum and faculty
Maxwell C. King, Brevard JC, Florida - student personnel, learning res.

Mildred Bain, Miami-Dade JC, Florida - learning centers

NORMAN COLLEGE — Norman Park, Georgia

W. Burkette Raper, Mt. Olive College, No. Carolina - administration
George Mehallis, Miami-Dade JC, Florida - faculty, physical plant
Robert Stripling, University of Florida - student personnel services

Merle H. Morgan, St. Petersburg JC, Florida - remedial educ., curriculum

REINHARDT COLLEGE — Waleska, Georgia

Marshall Hamilton, North Florida JC - administration and finance
Dayton Roberts, University of Florida - faculty and curriculum
James A. Kiser, Central Piedmont CC, No. Carolina - student personnel

E. B. Moore, Auburn University - curriculum, technical programs
Tedd Kelly, Consultants for Educ. Resources, Wash., DC - fund-raising
David Van Alstyne, North Florida JC - reading techniques

SOUTH GEORGIA COLLEGE — Douglas, Georgia

Ambrose Garner, Miami-Dade JC, Florida - administration, curriculum
Marie Piekarski, University of Kentucky - curriculum, nursing education
Shirley Wurz, Alfred A & T College, New York - student personnel services

Harry E. Davis, Bi-State Regional Med. Prog., St. Louis - medical facil.

CENTRAL FLORIDA JUNIOR COLLEGE — Ocala, Florida

Fred Wellman, Virginia Dept. of CC - curriculum
Dale P. Parnell, Oregon Dept. of Public Instruction - administration
Stuart Steiner, Genesee CC, New York - student personnel services

Ann Ackourey, Miami-Dade JC, Florida - faculty evaluation

LAKE CITY JUNIOR COLLEGE & FOREST RANGER SCHOOL — Lake City, Florida

Clifton W. Emery, Jr., Worcester JC, Massachusetts - administration
Benjamin R. Wygal, Dalton JC, Georgia - curriculum and instruction
Gordon D. Aumack, Campbell, California - student personnel services

Mildred Bain, Miami-Dade JC, Florida - learning resource centers
Edwin Kurth, University of Florida - vocational-technical education

LAKE-SUMTER JUNIOR COLLEGE — Leesburg, Florida

Louis Bender, Director of CC, Pennsylvania - administration & facilities
Raymond P. Perkins, University of Florida - curriculum & facilities
Gerald W. Bray, Rockingham CC, No. Carolina - student personnel services

NORTH FLORIDA JUNIOR COLLEGE — Madison, Florida

Clifton W. Emery, Jr., Worcester JC, Massachusetts - administration
Ann Ackourey, Miami-Dade JC, Florida - faculty and curriculum
Gordon D. Aumack, Campbell, California - student personnel services

John L. Baker, Central Florida JC - payroll systems
William R. Evans, University of Florida - media, educational TV

Region Four - Alabama - Tennessee

SOUTHERN UNION STATE JUNIOR COLLEGE — Wadley, Alabama

Fred L. Wellman, Virginia Dept. of Community Colleges - administration
Harold E. Shively, North Shore CC, Massachusetts - curriculum planning
Harold H. Hopper, Indian River JC, Florida - student personnel services

E. B. Moore, Auburn University, Alabama - consortia formation

MOBILE STATE JUNIOR COLLEGE — Mobile, Alabama

Thomas Diener, University of Georgia - administration
W. E. Combs, Florida A & M University - curriculum, occupational courses
John A. Davitt, Glendale College, California - student personnel services

E. B. Moore, Auburn University, Alabama - administration and curriculum
Johnnie Ruth Clarke, St. Petersburg JC, Florida - remedial programs
Richard A. Steele, Antioch College, Ohio - cooperative education

NORTHWEST ALABAMA STATE JUNIOR COLLEGE — Phil Campbell, Alabama

Gerald James, Rockingham CC, No. Carolina - administration, physical plant
Thomas Diener, University of Georgia - administration and curriculum
Stuart Steiner, Genesee CC, New York - student personnel services

Joseph Sutton, University of Alabama - consortia, relations with U. of A.

CUMBERLAND COLLEGE OF TENNESSEE — Lebanon, Tennessee

Dale Parnell, Oregon Dept. of Public Instruction - administration
Robert Wiegman, Florida Atlantic University - curriculum
John Davitt, Glendale College, California - student personnel services

Tedd Kelly, Consultants for Educ. Resources, Wash., D.C. - fund-raising
John Davitt - 2nd revisit at no cost to the program
Visit of two college officials to Glendale College in California

FREED-HARDEMAN COLLEGE — Henderson, Tennessee

Robert T. Novak, Orange County CC, New York - administration, curriculum
Ben W. Jones, Navarro JC, Texas - vocational & technical curricula
Russell O. Bloyer, Cuyahoga CC, Ohio - student personnel services

Tedd Kelly, Consultants for Educ. Resources, Wash., D.C. - fund-raising
George Benson, Harding College, Arkansas - private colleges

HIWASSEE COLLEGE — Madisonville, Tennessee

Mowat G. Fraser, Connecticut State Dept. of Education - administration
Galen N. Drewry, University of Georgia - curriculum & develop. programs
William I. Olsen, Merritt College, California - student personnel

Tedd Kelly, Consultants for Educ. Resources, Wash., D.C. - fund-raising
Thomas W. Gandy, Berry College, Georgia - development

MARTIN COLLEGE — Pulaski, Tennessee

Donald D. Fink, Montcalm CC, Michigan - administration & learning centers
Wilson F. Wetzler, Manatee JC, Florida - curriculum & campus planning
Jerry W. Bray, Rockingham CC, No. Carolina - student personnel services

Ken A. Brunner, University of Missouri - defining role of the college

MORRISTOWN COLLEGE — Morristown, Tennessee

Mowat G. Fraser, Connecticut State Dept. of Education - administration
Johnnie Ruth Clarke, St. Petersburg JC, Florida - curriculum & remedial
John Davitt, Glendale College, California - student personnel services

Region Five - Mississippi - Arkansas

MISSISSIPPI DELTA JUNIOR COLLEGE — Moorhead, Mississippi

William Dwyer, Massachusetts Board of Regional CC's - administration
E. B. Moore, Jr., Auburn University, Alabama - curriculum & technical ed.
William F. Taylor, Polk JC, Florida - student personnel services

C. J. Collum, Lee College, Texas - vocational-technical programs

COPIAH-LINCOLN JUNIOR COLLEGE — Wesson, Mississippi

James F. Hall, Dutchess CC, New York - administration & curriculum
Galen N. Drewry, University of Georgia - curriculum & cooperative programs
A. K. Smith, Miami-Dade JC, Florida - student personnel services

W. Kenneth Lindner, Schoolcraft College, Michigan - finance & business

EAST MISSISSIPPI JUNIOR COLLEGE — Scooba, Mississippi

William Dwyer, Massachusetts Board of Regional CC's - administration
E. B. Moore, Jr., Auburn University, Alabama - curriculum & technical ed.
William F. Taylor, Polk JC, Florida - student personnel services

HOLMES JUNIOR COLLEGE — Goodman, Mississippi

James L. Wattenbarger, University of Florida - administration
John Dunn, Peralta JC District, California - administration & finance
Joseph W. Fordyce, Santa Fe JC, Florida - student personnel services

Helen Hildebrand, Miami-Dade JC, Florida - instructional media

MARY HOLMES COLLEGE — West Point, Mississippi

John P. Turano, Adams State College, Colorado - curriculum development
Joseph W. Fordyce, Santa Fe JC, Florida - student personnel services

E. B. Moore, Auburn University, Alabama - administrative organization
Edwin E. Eddy, Santa Fe JC, Florida - admissions and records

SOUTHWEST MISSISSIPPI JUNIOR COLLEGE — Summit, Mississippi

James F. Hall, Dutchess CC, New York - administration and curriculum
Galen N. Drewry, University of Georgia - co-op programs and curriculum
A. K. Smith, Miami-Dade JC, Florida - student personnel services

SOUTHERN BAPTIST COLLEGE — Walnut Ridge, Arkansas

Maxwell C. King, Indian River JC, Florida - physical facilities
David L. Underwood, Florissant Valley CC, Missouri - curriculum
A. K. Smith, Miami-Dade JC, Florida - student personnel services

Tedd Kelly, Consultants for Educ. Resources, Wash., D.C. - fund-raising
L. E. O'Neill, JC District of St. Louis - facilities and budget planning

Region Six - Kentucky

LEES JUNIOR COLLEGE — Jackson, Kentucky

Fred Wellman, Virginia Dept. of Community Colleges - curriculum
Audrey Menefee, Mt. Vernon JC, Washington, D.C. - faculty development
James A. Kiser, Jr., Central Piedmont CC, No. Carolina - student pers.

John B. Carlson, Montcalm CC, Michigan - learning resources
Donald D. Fink, Montcalm CC, Michigan - learning resources
Richard Steele, Antioch College, Ohio - cooperative education
James Hefferman and David Dill, University of Michigan - Kentucky consortium

ALICE LLOYD COLLEGE — Pippa Passes, Kentucky

Bruce E. Whitaker, Chowan College, North Carolina - finance
Morris Norfleet, Morehead State U., Kentucky - curriculum development
William A. Robbins, Mohawk Valley CC, New York - student personnel

A team of student personnel specialists (May Jo Clark, William Fenstemacher, Jerald Hunt and Louis Rice) from the U. of Michigan

HENDERSON COMMUNITY COLLEGE — Henderson, Kentucky

Robert Knoebel, Pennsylvania Bureau of CC's - administration & finance
Marie Piekarski, University of Kentucky - health-related programs
James A. Kiser, Jr., Central Piedmont CC, No. Carolina - student pers.

Andrew S. Korim, Chicago City College, Illinois - community services
Charles R. Monroe, Chicago City College - instructional development

PADUCAH JUNIOR COLLEGE — Paducah, Kentucky

Clifford Erickson, Worcester JC, Massachusetts - administration
Mildred L. Bain, Miami-Dade JC, Florida - learning centers
Wallace B. Smith, Henry Ford CC, Michigan - student personnel services

SOUTHEASTERN CHRISTIAN COLLEGE — Winchester, Kentucky

Bill J. Priest, Dallas County JC District, Texas - administration
Richard H. Hagemeyer, Central Piedmont CC, No. Carolina - curriculum
H. Deon Holt, Dallas County JC District, Texas - student pers. & facilities

Budd E. Smith, Wingate College, North Carolina - private colleges
Sharvey Umbeck, Knox College, Illinois - meeting with trustees
A. B. Bonds, Baldwin-Wallace College, Ohio - meeting with trustees

SOUTHEAST COMMUNITY COLLEGE — Cumberland, Kentucky

Morris Norfleet, Morehead State U., Kentucky - administration
Ralph Granneberg, City College of San Francisco - faculty training
John I. Carhart, Contra Costa JC District, California - student pers.

Donald D. Fink, Montcalm CC, Michigan - learning resources
John B. Carlson, Montcalm CC, Michigan - learning resources

Region Seven - Michigan - Illinois - Indiana

MACOMB COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE — Warren, Michigan

Joe B. Rushing, Tarrant County JC District, Texas - community relations
Robert E. Lahti, Wm. Rainey Harper College, Illinois - faculty orient.
Phillip Speegle, Tarrant County JC District, Texas - student personnel

John Orcutt, AAJC, Washington, D.C. - student services
M. Frances Kelly, State Univ. of New York - evaluation

LANSING COMMUNITY COLLEGE — Lansing, Michigan

Lawrence E. Fox, Massachusetts Advisory Council on Educ. - administration
Norman C. Harris, University of Michigan - facilities planning, guidance
Marie R. Prahl, Michigan State University - student personnel services

John Orcutt, AAJC, Washington, D.C. - campus lecture series
Clifton R. Jones, Howard Univ., Wash., D.C. - social sci. demonstration

MICHIGAN CHRISTIAN COLLEGE — Rochester, Michigan

W. Burkette Raper, Mount Olive JC, No. Carolina - administration
M. Frances Kelly, State Univ. of New York - curriculum
Max Raines, Michigan State University - student personnel services

Vaughn Whited, Oakland Community College, Michigan - church-related work
Tedd Kelly, Consultants for Educ. Resources, Wash., D.C. - fund-raising

SUOMI COLLEGE — Hancock, Michigan

Isaac Beckes, Vincennes Univ., Indiana - administration, community rel.
Eric Bradner, Schoolcraft College, Michigan - curriculum
Wallace B. Smith, Henry Ford CC, Michigan - student personnel services
Clifford Erickson, San Mateo JC District, California - media, facilities

Tedd Kelly, Consultants for Educ. Resources, Wash., D.C. - fund-raising

BELLEVILLE JUNIOR COLLEGE — Belleville, Illinois

Harry E. Davis, Bi-State Regional Medical Program, St. Louis - administr.
Mildred Bain, Miami-Dade JC, Florida - learning centers, curriculum
Wallace B. Smith, Henry Ford CC, Michigan - student personnel services

Norman Harris, University of Michigan - occupational education

BLACK HAWK COLLEGE — Moline, Illinois

Eric J. Bradner, Schoolcraft College, Michigan - curriculum, administr.
Donald Fink, Montcalm CC, Michigan - learning resources
Russell Bloyer, Cuyahoga CC, Ohio - student personnel services

Mary Jane Calais, JC District of St. Louis - multi-campus business oper.

ILLINOIS VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE — La Salle, Illinois (now: Oglesby, Illinois)

John F. Grede, Chicago City College - administration, occupational ed.
Joseph T. Sutton, University of Alabama - data processing, administration
Alice Thurston, Cuyahoga CC, Ohio - student personnel, remedial educ.

JOLIET JUNIOR COLLEGE — Joliet, Illinois

Robert L. Appel, Rock Valley College, Illinois - administration
Pat Distasio, Miami-Dade JC, Florida - curriculum & learning methods
Russell O. Bloyer, Cuyahoga CC, Ohio - student personnel services

Eric J. Bradner, Schoolcraft College, Michigan - faculty contracts

VINCENNES UNIVERSITY — Vincennes, Indiana

Lawrence E. Fox, Massachusetts Advisory Council on Educ. - administration
Robert Lahti, Wm. Rainey Harper College, Illinois - curriculum
William A. Robbins, Mohawk Valley CC, New York - student personnel serv.

James J. Zigerell, Chicago TV College - use of TV on an institutional basis

Region Eight - Iowa - Minnesota - North Dakota

EASTERN IOWA COMMUNITY COLLEGE, MUSCATINE CAMPUS — Bettendorf, Iowa

Norman Watson, Orange Coast JC District, California - administration
William T. Mooney, Jr., El Camino College, California - curriculum
Dorothy Kearney, Citrus College, California - student personnel serv.
Glenn G. Gooder, Los Angeles City College - curriculum & instruction

John Orcutt, AAJC, Washington, D.C. - student services
Isaac K. Beckes, Vincennes University, Indiana - technical education
Gordon Wasinger, University of Iowa - adult education programs
Lawrence F. O'Neill, JC District of St. Louis - facilities & budget

EASTERN IOWA COMMUNITY COLLEGE, CLINTON CAMPUS — Clinton, Iowa

Norman Watson, Orange Coast JC District, California - administration
William T. Mooney, Jr., El Camino College, California - curriculum
Glenn G. Gooder, Los Angeles City College - curriculum & instruction
Dorothy Kearney, Citrus College, California - student personnel serv.

John Orcutt, AAJC, Washington, D.C. - student services
Isaac K. Beckes, Vincennes University, Indiana - technical education
Gordon Wasinger, University of Iowa - adult education programs
Lawrence F. O'Neill, JC District of St. Louis - facilities & budget

ELLSWORTH COLLEGE — Iowa Falls, Iowa

James D. Broman, Illinois Assoc. of JC - administration and finance
John J. Collins, Moorpark College, California - student personnel
Glenn G. Gooder, Los Angeles City College - developmental studies

William T. Mooney, Jr., El Camino College, California - phys. sciences

OTTUMWA HEIGHTS COLLEGE — Ottumwa, Iowa

W. Burkette Raper, Mount Olive JC, North Carolina - administration
M. Frances Kelly, State Univ. of New York - faculty & curriculum
Alice Thurston, University of Illinois - student personnel services

Tedd Kelly, Consultants for Educ. Resources, Wash., D.C. - fund-raising

MESABI STATE JUNIOR COLLEGE — Virginia, Minnesota

Isaac K. Beckes, Vincennes University, Indiana - administration
Patrick J. Distasio, Miami-Dade JC, Florida - curriculum
Dean M. McDonald, Treasure Valley CC, Oregon - student pers., learning

Keith W. Larson, Eastern Iowa CC-Muscatine - remedial instruction

BISMARCK JUNIOR COLLEGE — Bismarck, North Dakota

Stanley E. Van Lare, Alpena CC, Michigan - administration & finance
John F. Grede, Chicago City College - vocational-technical educ.
Dean M. McDonald, Treasure Valley CC, Oregon - student personnel

Gordon L. Starr, University of Minnesota - student union planning

LAKE REGION JUNIOR COLLEGE — Devil's Lake, North Dakota

Stanley E. Van Lare, Alpena CC, Michigan - administration & finance
John F. Grede, Chicago City College - vocational-technical education
Dean M. McDonald, Treasure Valley CC, Oregon - student personnel

Gordon L. Starr, University of Minnesota - student union planning

Region Nine - Kansas - Colorado - Missouri

DODGE CITY COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGE — Dodge City, Kansas

Mowat Fraser, Connecticut Dept. of Education - administration
Mayrelee Newman, El Centro College, Texas - library & learning resources
Don G. Creamer, El Centro College, Texas - student personnel services

John P. Turano, Adams State College, Colorado - improvement of instruction
Gordon L. Starr, University of Minnesota - student union services

COFFEYVILLE COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGE — Coffeyville, Kansas

Joe B. Rushing, Tarrant County JC District, Texas - administration
Ken August Brunner, University of Missouri - curriculum & development
Donald G. Leonard, Kansas State University - student personnel services

Mayrelee Newman, El Centro College, Texas - library & learning resources

INDEPENDENCE COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGE — Independence, Kansas

Joe B. Rushing, Tarrant County JC District, Texas - administration
Ken August Brunner, University of Missouri - curriculum & development
Donald G. Leonard, Kansas State University - student personnel services

Mayrelee Newman, El Centro College, Texas - library & learning resources

KANSAS CITY KANSAS COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGE — Kansas City, Kansas

Mowat Fraser, Connecticut Dept. of Education - administration
Robert Lahti, Wm. Rainey Harper College, Illinois - facilities
Max R. Raines, Michigan State University - student personnel services

Edward H. Redford, Merritt College, California - split-campus building
Kenneth Anderson, University of Kansas - community educational system

OTERO JUNIOR COLLEGE — La Junta, Colorado

J. C. Nichols, Weatherford College, Texas - administration & finance
Milo P. Johnson, Mt. San Jacinto College, California - curriculum
Shirley Wurz, Alfred A & T College, New York - student personnel

Keith W. Larson, Eastern Iowa CC-Muscatine Campus - remedial education

RANGELY COLLEGE — Rangely, Colorado

John P. Turano, Adams State College, Colorado - administration
Max Tadlock, Tadlock Associates, California - curriculum planning
Shirley Wurz, Alfred A & T College, New York - student personnel

MERCY JUNIOR COLLEGE — St. Louis, Missouri

A. W. Baisler, Jamestown CC, New York - administration & curriculum
Max Smith, Michigan State University - curriculum development
Jean Page, Prince George's CC, Maryland - student personnel services

Isaac K. Beckes, Vincennes University, Indiana - community survey

Region Ten - Oklahoma - Texas

ST. GREGORY'S COLLEGE — Shawnee, Oklahoma

Lloyd Messersmith, California JC Association - administration, consortia
C. C. Colvert, University of Texas at Austin - facilities, finance
Dorothy Kearney, Citrus College, California - student personnel

Tedd Kelly, Consultants for Educ. Resources, Wash., D.C. - fund-raising

CONNORS STATE COLLEGE — Warner, Oklahoma

Lloyd Messersmith, California JC Association - administration, consortia
Loyal Norman, Abraham-Baldwin Agric. College, Georgia - curriculum
Dorothy Kearney, Citrus College, California - student personnel

NORTHERN OKLAHOMA COLLEGE — Tonkawa, Oklahoma

Karl Drexel, Contra Costa JC District, California - administration
Alexander Lazzarino, University of Kansas - curriculum & facilities
Don Creamer, El Centro College, Texas - student personnel services

James J. Zigerell, Chicago TV College, Illinois - educational TV
Mayrelee Newman, El Centro College, Texas - remedial training

LAREDO MUNICIPAL JUNIOR COLLEGE — Laredo, Texas

Ben W. Jones, Navarro JC, Texas - administration, vocational training
Gordon D. Aumack, West Valley Joint JC District, California - faculty
Philip T. Speegle, Tarrant County JC District, Texas - student personnel

LEE COLLEGE — Baytown, Texas

Karl Drexel, Contra Costa JC District, California - administration
John Carhart, Contra Costa JC District, California - learning centers
Don Creamer, El Centro College, Texas - student personnel services

James W. Hobson, Univ. of California at Los Angeles - business office

RANGER JUNIOR COLLEGE — Ranger, Texas

L. M. Morton, Jr., Central Texas College - administration & facilities
Edward Redford, Merritt College, California - disadvantaged programs
William Olsen, Merritt College, California - student personnel services

SOUTHWEST TEXAS JUNIOR COLLEGE — Uvalde, Texas

Clyde R. Nail, San Antonio College, Texas - administration
Edward Redford, Merritt College, California - curriculum
William Olsen, Merritt College, California - student personnel services

TEXARKANA COLLEGE — Texarkana, Texas

Robert Novak, Orange County CC, New York - administration
John Carhart, Contra Costa JC District, California - planning & research
Edna P. Froelich, Merritt College, California - student personnel

Max Tadlock, Tadlock Associates, California - master planning
The president and dean of the faculty visited Orange County CC, New York.

WHARTON COUNTY JUNIOR COLLEGE — Wharton, Texas

Robert Novak, Orange County CC, New York - administration, teaching
Ralph T. Granneberg, City College of San Francisco - teacher evaluation
Dorothy L. Kearney, Citrus College, California - student personnel

James W. Reynolds, University of Texas at Austin - honors program
The president and a trustee visited junior colleges in California.

Region Eleven - Washington - California

YAKIMA VALLEY COLLEGE — Yakima, Washington

Amo De Bernardis, Portland CC, Oregon - administration, facilities
Douglas W. Burris, American River College, California - curriculum
Dean H. McDonald, Treasure Valley CC, Oregon - student personnel

Archie McPheran, California State Dept. of Education - facilities
Shirley Gordon, Highline College, Washington - curriculum & instruction
James Ford, Skagit Valley College, Washington - faculty improvement

COLUMBIA BASIN COLLEGE — Pasco, Washington

Fred Giles, University of Washington - administration & facilities
Douglas Burris, American River College, California - curriculum
J. Manning Nelson, Clark College, Washington - student personnel

no revisits made

PENINSULA COLLEGE — Port Angeles, Washington

Jack P. Hudnall, Bristol CC, Massachusetts - administration
Irvin Colt, Mt. San Antonio College, California - vocational educ.
Jeanette Poore, University of Washington - student personnel services

Charles Abshire, Yakima Valley College, Washington - dormitories
C. Weston Hatch, North Idaho Junior College - dormitories

WALLA WALLA COMMUNITY COLLEGE — Walla Walla, Washington

Harold Jacobsen, Seattle CC, Washington - administration & bus. management
Ralph Granneberg, City College of San Francisco - faculty evaluation
Jeanette Poore, University of Washington - student personnel services

Irvin Colt, Mt. San Antonio College, California - vocational education

LASSEN COLLEGE — Susanville, California

Merlin Eisenbise, Cuesta College, California - administration & faculty
Algeo H. Brill, Yuba College, California - curriculum & facilities
Herbert Lee Swanson, El Camino College, California - student personnel
Ralph Mathews, California State Dept. of Education - voc-tech education

Leslie Wilbur, University of Southern California - consortium arrangements

Region Twelve - Puerto Rico

A consultant team visited the island in July, 1968 and subsequent consultants worked with representatives from the member colleges at special organized workshops. The following colleges were associated with the program as members:

Puerto Rico Junior College, Rio Piedras
Humacao Regional College, University of Puerto Rico, Humacao
Aguadilla Regional College, Inter-American U. of Puerto Rico, Aguadilla
Arecibo Regional College, Inter-American U. of Puerto Rico, Arecibo
Barranquitas Regional College, Inter-American U. of Puerto Rico, Barranquitas
Bayamon Regional College, Inter-American U. of Puerto Rico, Bayamon
Ponce Regional College, Inter-American U. of Puerto Rico, Ponce

Consultants were as follows:

S. V. Martorana, State Univ. of New York - administration
Charles Rodrigues, Schenectady CC, New York - community relations
Dayton Y. Roberts, University of Florida - faculty, health-related occupat.
James Harvey, Wm. Rainey Harper College, Illinois - student personnel
James Wattenbarger, University of Florida - administration
Audrey Menefee, Mt. Vernon JC, Washington, D.C. - faculty & curriculum
Joseph Stokes, Inter-American University of P.R. - English as a 2nd language
Gil Saunders, AAJC, Washington, D. C. - occupational education
Lewis Fibel, AAJC, Washington, D. C. - occupational education
Richard A. Steele, Antioch College, Ohio - relations with industry & gov't
J. Kenneth Cummiskey, AAJC, Washington, D. C. - community relations
M. Frances Kelly, State Univ. of New York - faculty orientation

College officials from the island visited Miami-Dade Junior College in Florida in connection with a conference on the Mainland.

A P P E N D I X C

An Index To the Newsletter

DEVELOPING JUNIOR COLLEGES
American Association of Junior Colleges/Program With Developing Institutions
1968-1969 Program

#	Date	Title of Article or Description	Author or Source	Page
1	April 18	Foreword from the Editor	Selden Menefee	1
		A Word from Dr. Player (USOE)	Dr. Willa B. Player	1
		An Explanation of the Program		1
		First Meeting in Washington of PWDI		2
		Kentucky Progress Report (Lees JC)	Pres. Troy Eslinger	4
2	May 1	Plans for National Conference at Airlie House		1
		Regional Meetings Set for 12 Regions		2
		Puerto Rico Regional Session		2
		A Comment on Consultants	Pres. Scheidt of Yakima Valley Coll.	3
		Educational Shopping Center	Portland CC (Ore.)	3
		Notes from Maryland Meeting	Pres. Hankin of Harford JC	4
3	May 16	Conference Program Outlined		1
		Texas Consortium	Carl F. Perkins	2
		Notes from North Carolina		4
4	May 27	Airlie Conference Notes		1
		Regional Meetings Set for August		1
		Macomb Has Great Technical Program		1
		Notes from the South		2
		Quality in Higher Education (reprint)	John W. Gardner	2
5	June 6	PWDI New Mailing Address		1
		Airlie Notes		1
		Initiative in Oklahoma		1
		Consultant Teams Assigned to Colleges: Listing		1
6	June 26	Our Changing Two-Year Colleges	Edmund J. Gleazer	1
		A Word to Consultants (Initial Reports)		4
		Regional Workshop Meeting Dates		4
7	July 3	Remaining Schedule of Consultant Team Visits		1
		Federal Affairs Specials	John Mallan, AAJC	3
		Notes for Consultants (Tax-free travel)		3
		Iowa Consortium Plan	Waldorf College	3
		Coming Events: Regional Workshops		4
8	July 11	Title III Funds (Breakdown)	USOE	1
		Special Announcement for Teachers: Distribution of Roger Garrison's Book		1
		From Appalachia	Alice Lloyd College	2
		Language Can Be a Bridge or a Barrier		2
		Jobs in Plastics	Parade Magazine	2
		Note to Consultants (Individual Expense Accounts)		2
		Consortium?	"The Acquainter"	3
		Associate Colleges List		3
		Coming Events: Regional Workshops		4

#	Date	Title of Article or Description	Author or Source	Page
9	July 18	Consultation: Midpoint	The Editor	1
		Michigan Workshop		1
		Interstate Student Exchange Plan	Iowa-Ill. Meeting	2
		Divergent Views: Mutual Cooperation		2
		Regional Workshop Plans		2
		The Philosophical Base of a Junior College	Yosemite JC	3
		New Assistant Secretary for Education		4
		Summer Workshops; Coming Events		4
10	July 26	What Does a Good Student Personnel Policy Include?	James Kiser	1
		Notes to Consultants (Specialized Consultation)		2
		Proposed Regional Grouping in California		3
		Educational Facilities Conference Publication		3
		Associate Colleges		3
		Regional Workshop Assignments		4
		Coming Events		4
11	Aug. 7	Regional Workshop Plans	Regional Coord.	1
		Puerto Rico: A Special Report	Selden Menefee	3
		Cooperative Program in the South		4
		Fall Visits Being Scheduled		4
		This is Really Reaching Out		4
		Distribution of Drewry's Book, The Administrative Team		4
		Coming Events		4
12	Aug. 22	An Interim Report on Developing Colleges		1
		Regional Workshops Off to Good Start		3
		Vocational and Technical Education Conference		4
		Coming Events		4
13	Aug. 30	Sources of Federal Funds for Junior Colleges		1
		Mississippi Colleges Progress Rapidly		2
		Reaching the Average Student	Council for Advancement Newsletter	2
		Points for Survival	"College Management"	2
		Fund Raising: A Million Dollars a Week		3
		Health Occupations in North Carolina		3
		Successful Fund Raising	"College Management"	4
		New Publications of Significance		4
		Coming Events		4
14	Sept. 9	Report on the Regional Conferences	Selden Menefee	1
		The Role of the Consultant	John P. Turano	2
		Fall Revisit Dates		3
		Publications to be Sent (Planning for Development)		4
		Coming Events		4
15	Sept. 18	Kentucky Provides Model for Building Consortium		1
		Developments for Private Colleges from the Workshops		1
		KANEDCO - A Two-State Consortium (Kansas - Nebraska)		3
		Oklahoma Consortium		3
		Appalachian Program		3
		Central Office Notes: Staff News		3
		Notes to Consultants on Revisits		3
		95 Associate Colleges Now		4
		Coming Events		4

#	Date	Title of Article or Description	Author or Source	Page
16	Sept. 27	Advantages of the Administrative Team	W. B. Raper	1
		Attention: Development Officers	"Foresight"	2
		Occupational Needs and the Community College		2
		Carnegie Grant for Negro Educational Study		4
		New Program to Train Junior College Teachers		4
		Coming Events		4
17	Oct. 11	New AAJC Program Planned; Faculty Development Stressed		1
		Lebanon Conference Helps Private Colleges		2
		New Consortia in the Making	Selden Menefee	3
		Special Workshop for Eastern Private Colleges		3
		Coming Events		4
18	Oct. 21	New Oklahoma Consortium Formed;	California Consortium	1
		More Consortium News		1
		Alice Lloyd College Gets Five Foundation Grants		1
		Innovative Harford		2
		Vincennes and the HEP Pioneer Program		2
		Instructional Resources Pre-Conference		2
		Public Relations Book Out		2
		On the Budget		2
		More Consortia are Formed		2A
		Montreat Workshop for Private Colleges		2B
		Grants to Allied Health Programs		3
		Vocational Education Publication		3
		Chicago TV College Plans Faculty Development Films		3
		New Associate Degree Programs at Prairie State		3
		More New Occupational Programs in our Assoc. Colleges		4
		Coming Events		4
		1969-1970 Project		4
19	Nov. 1	1969-70 AAJC Project Notes		1
		Alabama Colleges Form Consortium		2
		A Consultant's Suggestion	Harold Shively	3
		Vincennes Conference on Student Rights Announced		3
		AAJC New Institutions and Community Services Projects		3
		More Associate Colleges		4
		Coming Events		4
20	Nov. 15	News of the 1969-70 Project		1
		More News on Consortia		1
		Montreat Private College Conference Report		3
		Reinhardt Gets Appalachian Grant		3
		Conferences Planned for Early 1969		4
		Coming Events		4
21	Nov. 22	Junior College Student Characteristics	Dorothy Knoell	1
		Plans Laid for JC Library Sessions	Mayrelee Newman	4
		Coming Events		4
22	Nov. 29	Occupational Education Workshops Now Set		1
		Innovations at Illinois	Terry O'Banion	1
		South Carolina Story	No. Greenville JC	2
		Texas Notes		2
		Vincennes University Praised		2
		Pioneer Program in Social Services		3
		New Associate Colleges		3

#	Date	Title of Article or Description	Source or Author	Page
		Innovation: Mini-College	"Jottings"	3
		Mississippi Ford Grant	Ford Foundation	4
		Washington Consortium		4
		Coming Events		4
23	Dec. 12	Agreement Reached on Student Rights and Responsibilities in the Junior College	John Orcutt	1
		Workshops Set on Community and Public Relations		3
		Speakers Announced for Occupational Workshops		4
		Coming Events		4
24	Dec. 31	Occupational Workshop Programs Set		1
		Dr. Max Smith Dies Suddenly		2
		Florida Regional Conference Set		2
		How to Get a Computer the Easy Way		2
		The Smithsonian Institute Touring Performances	"The Acquainter"	2
		Gleazer Book Sent to Colleges		3
		Student Personnel Guide Available		3
		Note on Improvement of Instruction	Dodge City CJC	3
		Student Unrest and the Small College	Otero Junior C.	3
		Associate Colleges Top 180		4
		Coming Events		4
25	Jan. 14	Program for AAJC Convention Set		1
		Registrations Due for Occupational Workshops		2
		Jim Falkenstine Passes		2
		Conference on Effective Academic Teams Soon		2
		Puerto Rican Meetings Set		2
		Booklet on Private Junior Colleges Out (Monograph #2)		2
		Thoughts on Faculty Orientation	John J. Connolly	3
		For Peace in 1969!	PWDI Staff	4
		Coming Events		4
26	Jan. 27	Conference on Community Services & Public Relations Set		1
		What Does a Good Student Personnel Policy in the Private Junior College Include?	William Robbins	2
		Faculty Orientation Model Described		2
		Student Retreat at Mount Olive, North Carolina		3
		California JC Association Seminars Set for February		4
		Coming Events		4
27	Feb. 5	Secretary Finch Speaks		1
		James Allen is New Commissioner		1
		Register for Workshop		1
		Federal Health Officials to Attend Workshops		2
		Carnell to Speak		2
		Puerto Rico Report		2
		New Format Succeeds at Georgia - Florida Workshop		3
		Notes for PWDI Travelers		3
		American Education Reprints		3
		Muskegon County CC's Stand on Student Disorders		4
		Coming Events		4

#	Date	Title of Article or Description	Source or Author	Page
28	Feb. 10	EPDA Grants are Announced		1
		Notes from the Southeast Member Colleges		2
		Cooperative Program in Kentucky		3
		Student Personnel Consortium		3
		Michigan Christian in "Inner City" Program		4
		A Consultant's Suggestion		4
		Coming Events		4
29	Feb. 17	Workshops in JC Community and Public Relations Set		1
		Finch Plans New Aid to Junior Colleges		2
		Publications on Trusteemanship and Technology Sent Out		2
		Note to Consultants		2
		Chicago City College News		2
		Special Meeting on JC Institutional Research		2
		Private Support Given Public Junior Colleges		3
		Let Signs Mark Your Campus and Your Town	John Orcutt	3
		"Where the Money Is"		3
		Associate Colleges List		4
		Wiegman Book on General Education		4
		National Advisory Council on Vocational Education		4
		Coming Events		4
30	Feb. 28	Senator Williams Introduces Community College Bill		1
		Carnell to Outline Things to Come		1
		Occupational Education Workshops Popular		2
		Register for Community Relations Workshops		4
		The CJC: An Annotated Bibliography on sale		4
		Coming Events		4
31	Mar. 19	Task Force Statement on Junior Colleges		1
		Conference on Multi-Campus Problems Set		1
		AAJC Convention at Atlanta Well Attended		1
		1969-70 Program Announcement Delayed		2
		Miami Diplomate Program Open		2
		Last Call for Moline Community Relations Workshop		2
		Excerpts from an AAJC Convention Speech	Ralph Nader	2
		Senator Mondale Challenges Educators		3
		EPDA JC Grant to Train Teacher Aides		3
		New International Program		3
		Regional Institutes on OEP This Summer		4
		Jack Orcutt Moves to USOE		4
		New Reading Program at Mineral Area JC		4
		Two Summer Workshops for JC's at Catholic U.		4
		Coming Events		4
32	Apr. 10	New Project is Announced		1
		National Advisory Committee, 1969-70 PWDI		2
		List of Colleges Funded for Participation in 69-70		2
		Higher Education's Prospects for Next Year		3
		Winston-Salem Program on Community Services Set		3
		Community Relations Workshops Attract Many		4
		Coming Events		4

#	Date	Title of Article or Description	Author or Source	Page
33	Apr. 15	Survey Shows Need in Faculty Development Field		1
		Great Teacher Seminar		1
		Instructional Development Program at U. of Texas		1
		Urgent Notice on Journal Subscription		2
		Florida Conference on Public Relations		2
		Tallahassee JC & Inter-American Program		2
		OEP Development Institutes Set		2
		DeKalb College Has Overseas Campus		2
		A Comment About the PWDI	Pres. Carnahan Yakima Valley C.	2
		Voters Approve JC Bond Issues		3
		Instructional Technology Conference		3
		A.A. Degree in Afro-American Studies		3
		Remarks on Vocational Education		3
		Brevard Junior College Helps the Poor		4
		Mobile Education at Orange County CC		4
		Coming Events		4
34	Apr. 25	$5 Million Cut From Title III Request for Next Year		1
		Mobile State Joins the Program for 1969-70		1
		Puerto Rico Holds Workshop, Gets New Grant		1
		Final Evaluation of 1968-69 Program	Selden Menefee and Esperanza C. Alzona	2
		Gov. Scott Will Keynote Winston-Salem Conference		3
		More Time and Money		3
		Consortium Formed in Charlotte Area		3
		Cooperative Press in Kentucky		3
		Richmond Community College of Kentucky		4
		News Media Training Urged for Minority Groups		4
		Coming Events		4
35	May 9	Advisory Committee Sets Conference Theme; Keynote Speakers Selected for Vincennes		1
		Regional Coordinators Report		2
		Consultant Visits Start		2
		The Issue: Full Funding		3
		Multi-Campus Meet Held		3
		MCCC's Project MAST Now in Its Second Year		4
		PWDI Monograph #3 on Occupational Education Out		4
		Coming Events		4
36	May 16	"Strategy for Change" - Reserve Now for Vincennes Conf.		1
		Register Now for Instructional Technology Conference		2
		JC Orientation Grant Approved		2
		Campus Visit Brings Out New Ideas		3
		New JC Bibliography Sent Out to PWDI Members		3
		Columbia U. Teachers College Summer Conference		3
		Student Union Seminar is Set for July		3
		New Systems Approach to English Instruction		4
		Librarianship Training at Appalachian State Univ.		4
		Coming Events		4

#	Date	Title of Article or Description	Author or Source	Page
37	May 28	Get Those Vincennes Reservations Now!		1
		Notice to College Coordinators		1
		Is Innovation Relevant?	Arthur Cohen, UCLA	2
		North Carolina Success Stories		3
		Notice to Consultants and Colleges		3
		After Vincennes, the ALA Atlantic City Meeting		3
		Stanley Van Lare Passes		4
		New Guidance and Placement Program for JC's		4
		Coming Events		4
38	June 4	Revised Program, Vincennes Conference		1
		Missouri Summer Conference on Instruction		2
		ABAC Gets New Rural Development Center		3
		JC Student Conference Set for August 16-19		3
		Fiscal Management Seminars at St. Anselm's College		3
		Comparative Guidance and Placement Program		3
		Montcalm Gets Kellogg Grant		4
		Two-Year College Chemistry Conference in Salt Lake City		4
		Coming Events		4
39	June 13	Now Is The Time, Says Gleazer		1
		About Vincennes....		1
		Principal Consultants to Member Colleges Listed		2
		Carolina Region Sets Objectives		3
		Grades Being Down-Graded	CTA Journal	3
		First Regional Newsletter Appears (Region VII)		3
		Change in Project Staff: Brent Smith for E. C. Alzona		4
		On Student Personnel Services	John Davitt	4
		Coming Events		4
40	June 27	Report On the Vincennes Conference		1
		"Focus on Action" is Published		2
		Junior College Film Now Available		3
		Tutorial Program in No. Carolina	"Education" (Wayne County)	3
		Upcoming Conferences		3
		Students Rally to Support Norman College		3
		Cards and Letters Have Effect		4
		Coming Events		4

The Newsletter carried on into the 1969-70 year.

A P P E N D I X D

Expenditure of PWDI Funds in 1968-69 Program

The management of the expenditure of funds in the 1968-69 program reflects the careful and frugal use of money within the purposes and the rules and regulations that governed the program during its year of operation. The program was originally budgeted to terminate March 31, 1969; but it became possible, because of savings made in planning the expenditures, to extend the central office operations to June 30, 1969 with the initial year's funds. This made possible phasing out the work of the previous year while preparing for the new project to begin formally on July 1, 1969. Expenses of the second National Conference, under the 1969-70 project, were met after July 1.

Almost 43% of the money was expended for consultants, 15% for national and regional conferences, about 13% for AAJC administrative services, 3% for publications, and the remainder on central office salaries, travel, office supplies and expenses, National Advisory Committee meetings and some expenses of college participants at the AAJC convention in Atlanta, Georgia.

There were two requests, in January and in May, to revise the budget by transferring surpluses in some line items to take care of deficits in other line items. These requests were approved.

The line amounts of the budget, as first approved and as finally expended, are as follows:

AAJC Program With Developing Institutions

Summary of Budget and Expenditures for Period: April 1, 1968-June 30, 1969

Budget Line Categories	Amount Budgeted	Expenditures*
Salaries, Taxes - Benefits	$70,000	$86,647
Travel	8,000	6,017
Office Supplies and Expenses	15,000	15,208
National Advisory Committee	7,276	3,341
National Conference	49,530	36,422
Consultants	200,880	196,664
Regional Conferences	23,920	30,209
Special Project (Puerto Rico)	13,386	9,358
Publications	18,500	14,363
AAJC Convention	5,100	2,165
Administrative Services	61,724	61,729

Total Amount Budgeted	473,316			
Reimbursements to National Conf. Fund from College Travel Funds	6,273			
Total	$479,589	Total Expended	$462,123	Balance $17,466*

The amount of $17,466.00 was carried over on the project books to take care of obligations incurred during the life of the 1968-69 Program for which claims had not yet been submitted, and to allow the financing of the beginning of the new project, the funds for which were expected during the last part of July.

Every effort was made to handle the payment of claims promptly. Approval of claims was handled by the central office of the program, and the accounting office of the American Association of Junior Colleges attended to the recording, disbursing and accounting of the funds. Monthly reports on the condition of the accounts were made available to USOE by the accounting office.

---

*These figures are from the monthly financial reports prepared by the accounting office of the American Association of Junior Colleges.